ROLE OF GLEANING IN EFFORTS TO ALLEVIATE HUNGER

HEARING

BEFORE THE

DOMESTIC TASK FORCE

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, AUGUST 5, 1987

Serial No. 100-14

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on Hunger

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

78-185 WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

MICKEY LELAND, Texas, *Chairman*

TONY P. HALL, Ohio
BOB TRAXLER, Michigan
LEON E. PANETTA, California
VIC FAZIO, California
SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
PETER H. KOSTMAYER, Pennsylvania
BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota
BOB CARR, Michigan
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
MIKE ESPY, Mississippi
FLOYD H. FLAKE, New York
JAMES H. BILBRAY, Nevada
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
ELIZABETH J. PATTERSON, South Carolina

BILL EMERSON, Missouri
*Vice Chairman**
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
SID MORRISON, Washington
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH, Oregon
DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska
FREDERICK S. UPTON, Michigan
HANK BROWN, Colorado
GUY V. MOLINARI, New York

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

MIRANDA G. KATSOYANNIS, *Chief of Staff*
JOHN D. CUTTELL, *Minority Staff Director*

DOMESTIC TASK FORCE

LEON E. PANETTA, California, *Chairman*

BOB TRAXLER, Michigan
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
MIKE ESPY, Mississippi
FLOYD H. FLAKE, New York
JAMES H. BILBRAY, Nevada
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
ELIZABETH J. PATTERSON, South Carolina
MICKEY LELAND, Texas
(Ex Officio)

SID MORRISON, Washington
FREDERICK S. UPTON, Michigan
HANK BROWN, Colorado
BILL EMERSON, Missouri
(Ex Officio)

---

*Effective July 13, 1987.

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, DC, August 5, 1987	1
Statement of:	
Arneaud, Susan, acting human services adviser to the Governor, State of Michigan	12
Buchanan, Rev. Ray, codirector, Society of St. Andrew, Big Island, VA	9
Flake, Hon. Floyd H., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, opening statement of	1
Hall, Hon. Tony P., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio	2
Myers, Peter, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture	6
Smith, Hershel, potato farmer, Blaine, ME	13
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, et cetera:	
Arneaud, Susan, acting human services adviser to the Governor, State of Michigan:	
"Chapter 5. Credits Against Tax," copied from Michigan compiled laws annotated	47
"Enrolled House Bill No. 4202," Act No. 110, July 10, 1987	44
[No. 130], [HB 4494]	46
Buchanan, Rev. Ray A., codirector, Society of St. Andrew, Big Island, VA:	
"Gleaning 1986," Emergency Resource Bank, Dayton, OH	34
Prepared statement of	28
Responses to questions submitted by Hon. Tony P. Hall	43
Society of St. Andrew's Potato Project, produce donation report through June 1987	36
"Summary: 'Potato Project' delivers 53 million pounds of potatoes to feed the nation's hungry"	42
Crowley, Brian P., Senior Associate Director, Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, U.S. General Accounting Office, letter to Hon. Leon E. Panetta, dated August 4, 1987	52
Hall, Hon. Tony P., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, prepared statement of	20
Myers, Peter, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, responses to questions submitted by Hon. Tony P. Hall	26
Riggle, James D., director of field operations, American Farmland Trust, prepared statement of	50
Smith, Herschel A., potato farmer, Blaine, ME, prepared statement of	48

ROLE OF GLEANING IN EFFORTS TO ALLEVIATE HUNGER

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1987

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
DOMESTIC TASK FORCE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER,
Washington, DC.

The select committee met, pursuant to notice, at 1:10 p.m., in room 210, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Floyd H. Flake (acting chairman of the task force) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Espy and Gilman.

Also present: Representative Hall.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. FLOYD H. FLAKE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. FLAKE. The task force will come to order at this time. Several of our Members are on the Floor voting, but they will join us shortly, and so at this time, we'd like to proceed with the hearing of the Select Committee on Hunger regarding Public Law 99–198, to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, provide for agricultural support, resource, conservation, farm credit, agricultural research and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes.

Today the Domestic Task Force of the Select Committee on Hunger will examine the potential role of gleaning as a means of supplementing the food supply of needy Americans. To some of you, gleaning is a new word, for others there are some questions as to how gleaning relates to efforts to alleviate hunger.

Gleaning precedes any coordinated or organized method for helping to feed those who are unable to feed themselves. It is a practice which dates back to ancient times. For those of us who are Biblical, our reference comes from the Book of Leviticus. And its words are, when you reap the harvest of your land, do not reap to the very edges of your field or gather the gleanings of your harvest. Do not go over your vineyard a second time or pick up the grapes that are fallen. Leave them for the poor and alien.

Over the years the spirit of gleaning has not changed. The practice as we know it today involves the collecting of fruits and vegetables from farms after commercial harvesting has taken place. The food is gathered by members of religious, civil, charitable, and other nonprofit organizations across the country, which channel

the fruits of their labor to the needy through soup kitchens, food pantries, and emergency feeding outlets.

One of the most important aspects of the practice is that all of this food if not harvested by gleaners would have gone to waste. As a result of the growing awareness of the extent of hunger in this country, I've come to understand that any food that goes to waste represents a missed opportunity to feed hungry people.

Today we will hear from witnesses who are involved in successful gleaning activities and from those who can provide us with some insight on how we can expand gleaning activities and opportunities to put to good use the millions of pounds of food which is wasted in this country each year.

We're pleased to have as our first witness today, the Honorable Tony Hall of Ohio, who is chairman of the Select Committee's International Task Force. Congressman Hall has been an ardent supporter of gleaning activities in his district, his State, and across the Nation, as a means of increasing the supply of food available to the poor.

Congressman Hall, we're happy to welcome you today, and your prepared statement will be placed in the record. At this time, you may proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. TONY P. HALL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. HALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I commend you and the Members of the Domestic Task Force on these hearings, a subject in which I have a very keen interest and I have some first-hand experience.

I think you've explained what gleaning is, and where gleaning has come from. I wish I could say that I was the originator of the term "gleaning." It is not only ancient, but it is Biblical as well. And it has turned into a wonderful project in Ohio.

We started gleaning last year. We were familiar with the term "gleaning", we wanted to do it and we had a lot of enthusiasm. But we didn't really know what direction to go and we weren't particularly organized, except that we had a lot of people that had enormous zeal for the issue of domestic hunger. We also had a lot of people in our backyard that were hungry. For example, a few years ago we had 164,000 people just in my area that at one time or another during the year asked for food. In the last quarter of that year, we had to turn away 5,000 people because there was not enough food available.

Gleaning is an issue that there are so many good things about. One, vegetables and fruits that are picked are clean, they're healthy, and you can get them to the food banks quickly. Two, gleaning can be done as a non-Government program, so you don't have the redtape and the bureaucracy involved. You don't have to worry about layers of Government regulations. Three, the program really is cost effective. When I say it's cost-effective, I mean it hardly costs anything, except for a few dollars up front to pay for lunches and cans of pop and orange juice, and those kinds of things, for people working in the fields. So there's hardly any expense at all connected with it at all.

Four, gleaning is good because there is an abundance of food that is available that wouldn't be picked, and probably would be plowed under. Five, the fellowship of the people that work in the fields is a wonderful thing to behold. You'll see people working in the fields picking corn, that have diamond rings on, and right next to them, are people that the night before were walking the streets looking for food and looking for shelter. There's a certain amount of fellowship and a wonderful feeling there associated with doing things together. Six, there's a need for food, there's a need for an abundance of food, and there's a need for people to help out, not only in the Dayton, Ohio area, which is my district, but in all 50 States. There's a hunger problem in this country which most people are not aware of. And seven, the issue of gleaning, and the ability to participate in it, brings about a knowledge of hunger that most people don't have. It makes a whole bunch of people proponents for the issue of hunger. That helps, not only when you want to glean the next year, but it helps with all kinds of related issues, whether they are legislative hunger issues or local projects to feed people. It's very, very important to really educate people on the issue of hunger and the role gleaning can play. A lot of people last year were very suspicious of this whole topic of gleaning. They didn't understand the term, and No. 2, they didn't believe that there were some people that were hungry in their own backyard. They also didn't think that the food actually was going to get to food banks, because they thought people were just looking for possibly a free handout. In fact, none of those ideas or suspicions were proved correct at all. As a matter of fact, it was just the opposite.

This gleaned food has gone out to 66 food banks in my District. Gleaning is done in various parts of the country, but not in any wholesale fashion or through any formal network. It's not done as statewide projects, but many communities in many States have individual gleaning projects. It's done here in Virginia. We have a wonderful expert here, Rev. Ray Buchanan, who will tell us more about it. It was done in Toledo, Ohio before we even started in Dayton. It was done in California by senior gleaners. So, in various parts of the country gleaning is taking place.

Think in terms of the fact that there are 60 million tons of food every year in this country, that for one reason or another, doesn't get picked, or rots on the floor of the field, or in the course of transporting the food, doesn't make it, or spoils, or sits in the warehouse of a grocery store. Somewhere along the line 60 million tons of food, that's an approximate figure according to GAO, spoils and goes to waste. People are very, very hungry in this country. It's not the kind of hunger where people are dying like they did in Ethiopia. They're not dying in any massive way of malnutrition. But they're dying of infections, infant mortality rates, and other causes related to hunger.

You're seeing a lot of people in this country including many children that are going to bed a couple days during the month without food at all. Gleaning is not the sole answer. But gleaning, I think, can be part of the answer, because it's a wonderful source of food that is free. It's clean, it's good, it's fresh, you can get at it. You don't have to have a tremendous amount of knowledge or expertise to pick it.

We started off in Dayton, as I said before, with a lot of enthusiasm, but we didn't have a heck of a lot of know-how. We had some food experts, and we had a lot of people that were dedicated to the issue of hunger. We asked a few people to get together and we talked to a few churches and some schools and synagogues. In a matter of weeks we gathered in the first field and we started picking. The first year, since we got kind of a late start, we picked about 21 tons of food. This included tomatoes, beans, sweet corn, squash, broccoli, cabbage, watermelon, cantaloupes, sweet pod peas, apples, cucumbers, pinto beans, zucchini, mustard greens, cauliflower, beets, leaf lettuce, pumpkins, and a lot of strawberries, 1½ tons of strawberries.

This was all done in a period of two months. The success of gathering approximately 21 tons of food made us decide to do it again the following year, which is this summer. At the same time we decided to try to take the whole idea of gleaning statewide in the State of Ohio. I convened a group of about 150 to 200 food people. They were people that would run food pantries, or food banks, farmers, students, church people, and others interested in the hunger issue. I asked them to come from different parts of Ohio. And we met in Columbus in the Spring, and suggested to them that if they truly believe in the issue of gleaning, after hearing what we had to say that they go back to their own county and organize a project. We shared our information on how to organize a project that could be successful in bringing in tons and tons of food. We're not yet sure how successful that effort to glean statewide in Ohio has been, because it just started this summer. But we know of 10 communities in Ohio, outside of Dayton and Toledo and the Akron-Canton area, that are starting to glean the fields in an effort to feed the hungry.

It's exciting to see how people change. People that were skeptical a year ago, 1 year later are excited about the whole idea of gleaning. As a matter of fact, over the weekend in my district, a farmer called and he offered an acre of silver corn. Farmers before this have been calling us offering their crops. Two churches have actually planted acres of beans for us. The city of Dayton is donating 9 acres from their community garden. These are outright donations. Gleaning projects often trigger this kind of generosity.

This year we're going to pick well over 21 tons. I expect it to go well beyond that. I'm not sure what the figure is going to be, but it's exciting to see how people can work together in a non-Government way, and make something happen, and really deliver a product that's really, really needed.

I'm not sure what else I can say to you, Mr. Chairman. I do have a very long statement that I'd like to have as part of the record and two other papers that go with it.

Mr. FLAKE. By unanimous consent.

Mr. HALL. I can thank you for the chance to be here. I think it will be really interesting to listen to some of the experts that we have today that have gleaned food in a much more massive way, than what I've described. So, I just thank you for the chance to be here and testify.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hall appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 20.]

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you, sir.

I want to commend you for an excellent idea that's taking shape and seems to me to indicate the possibility for other development in other areas of the country. And I think it's a tremendous approach to what I consider to be a major pressing problem.

Let me just ask a couple of things. You made the point, several times, that gleaning was a non-Government program. And the fact that you mentioned it a few times, seems to indicate that you feel that that, in part, helps it to be successful. Would you gloss over that, just so that we might get some sense of how you feel that helps or hurts the program?

Mr. HALL. I'm not saying that Government can't help in the issue of hunger. They've helped for many, many years. And if it wasn't for our Government, and the governments of the world, food and the kinds of programs that were delivered to sub-Sahara, Africa, probably would have never come about. Domestically, the Government helps a great deal through food stamps and other hunger programs.

On the other hand, as you know, a project like this, is often small and very local. Without having to worry about to many regulations, without having to draw up complicated legislation, food needs can be met. If people have enough enthusiasm and a little bit of ability to organize, that's about all you need, except the willingness to go into the fields and pick the commodities. You may need some cars and possibly trucks to transport crops to the local food bank. That's about all it takes. The Government certainly can help facilitate this, but it doesn't need to run the project.

Mr. FLAKE. Are those cars and trucks and other equipment usually donated by charitable groups?

Mr. HALL. Normally donated by charitable groups, quite often churches, but other times private voluntary organizations like Red Cross and those kinds of groups.

Mr. FLAKE. In cases where you have used city land, as in Dayton, where you've had a contribution of land, does then the city government get involved in the process, or generally do they allow the land to be given with no strings attached?

Mr. HALL. No strings attached, as far as I know, about this land. It was just given to us this year. They're not giving us the land, they're just giving us the land to plow and to plant, and we can use the crops as we see fit, as long as it goes to feed the poor, and the commodities go to the 66 food banks. The city of Dayton has been wonderfully supportive of these efforts. That shows in the fact that they've given us this land to plant some of these crops.

Mr. FLAKE. How many acres were used to produce the 21 tons of crops?

Mr. HALL. You know, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure. Approximately eight farms let us glean their crops.

Mr. FLAKE. I only raised the question, because I know in most urban centers there are vacant pockets of land, and perhaps that's a source worth looking into, to try to determine how in these urban communities, particularly, we might be able to impact upon the overall problem of feeding hungry people.

Now are these people generally homeless people who volunteer to do the work?

Mr. HALL. No. It's mostly the other way. You see a few homeless people, and I only cite that as an example, but most people are just wonderful people that volunteer their services. They either belong to a church, or they've been motivated in some way because of the issue, or they're a young person. We even have senior citizens. We had, I believe, some people from some county homes, some mentally retarded people. Everybody is invited to participate, and it's a wonderful project for fellowship, too.

One of the interesting things that I didn't state, that I remember as we begin to talk a little bit about the issue, is the fact that I'm amazed at how much food there really is when you glean. I myself was part of the original project last year when we went over the fields and picked green beans. This was a field that had already been picked for the market to sell. The farmers said to go back over these fields and pick whatever we could find. And there was so many green beans left. I mean, it was phenomenal. There were crates, and crates, and pounds and pounds of them. Another time we picked corn, and I was surprised that this whole field of corn was going to be plowed under. I said, "Well why would you plow this under? It's looks like perfectly good corn." The owner said, "Because if you look at the corn"—he pulled off the leaves on it—I'm not sure what you call it, the official name—he pulled it off and there was a few kernels missing on the end—"we can't sell this." I said, "So because you can't sell it, it will rot, right?" And he said, "Right, you might as well take it."

It was perfectly good corn. And there was just tons and tons. When you consider 60 million tons available in this country, it's out there.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you very much.

Mr. HALL. Thank you.

Mr. FLAKE. At this time we are going to move to the second panel, and Mr. Hall will be coming forward to Chair the remainder of this hearing. We're going to call to the table, Mr. Peter Myers. Mr. Myers is the Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, and we'd like to hear his statement regarding this issue. He has been in the business of farming both crops and livestock for the past 27 years. In 1982 he joined the U.S. Department of Agriculture and has served as its Deputy Secretary since 1986. We're happy to welcome you here today, Mr. Myers, and as soon as Mr. Hall is in the Chair, you may begin your testimony.

Mr. HALL [presiding]. Mr. Myers.

Mr. MYERS. Are you ready, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF PETER MYERS, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MYERS. Let me say, after listening to your very excellent testimony, there's not a lot I can add. But I do want to thank you very much for the privilege to be here today. In fact I feel a little inadequate after what you've done and the efforts you and Ray Buchanan, who's going to testify later, as well as other people in the country that really work on gleaning. It makes those of us that

have not been directly involved in recent years, realize there's a lot to do.

I do have to tell you, though, a little story while I'm at it. I can remember as a boy working on vegetable farms in Wisconsin, wondering why we were plowing up that cabbage that we couldn't sell. Or why a lot of those potatoes went to waste. I very vividly remember those things. It's very important that we do this.

And then also, as a 4-H leader, I did work with 4-H groups in gleaning, but we didn't take what we gleaned and directly take it to the people in need. The 4-H groups used what they picked up to sell for their own projects. So, here again, we're taking this ancient Biblical concept of gleaning and providing food for people that need it.

Let me say that the Department of Agriculture is involved, indirectly. I've discovered since being involved in gleaning that many of our State extension people on local levels are involved in local efforts for gleaning. California would come to mind, as do Michigan, Illinois, and in other places that we are not aware of, that extension groups have gone out and done gleaning as projects. So I think that we have been involved.

But I would also say, and it's your experience too, that most farmers would welcome groups to come out and glean and take this produce and provide it to people that are in need. There would probably be some farmers that would worry about liability of people being on their land. Here again, I think some States have addressed these problems. Michigan is attempting to address this particular problem. So there are problems that do arise.

I can tell you personally, and from the Department, we would welcome the opportunity to work with you to facilitate the efforts for volunteer and local groups to do gleaning all over the United States. And we stand ready to help you in ways that we can, Mr Chairman.

Thank you.

Mr. HALL. I want to thank you, Mr. Myers, for coming to be with us today, and certainly your support for gleaning. Your personal support is very, very commendable. I appreciate your activities in Ohio and helping me promote it in a personal way, when you came out this last Spring to talk to many of the farmers, and people involved in hunger projects.

Just a couple of questions. What can we do to gather the information that there seems to be a lot of on unharvested crops, and make it available for organizations that are interested in gleaning? Do you have any ideas along that line? It seems to be a concern of many people across the country.

Mr. MYERS. Well, an immediate thought would come to my mind, is go to some of the marketing cooperatives and other organizations that handle our vegetables and our fruits. They would probably be the immediate sources of knowing where the concentrations of these crops were. It would obviously vary from State to State. Some States have very little vegetable and fruit production. Other States have a lot of it, concentrated in certain areas. Our Agricultural Marketing Service could probably give us some information as to where we would go in these areas and who we could turn to.

Mr. HALL. It seems that one of the problems, as I understand, is there needs to be in some fashion, some pattern set up to establish a national clearinghouse, where people could call in with some information. For example, farmers could call in and say we have these fields full of tomatoes, or potatoes, or corn. Other people could call in, those involved not only with farming, but involved with food banks and people involved with transportation. There could be some national clearinghouse. There's been some suggestions made to me as to how we might do this. I was wondering if you might have any ideas along this line that, is there a way we could facilitate this problem?

Mr. MYERS. We don't have any direct clearinghouses in the Department. We do work with several, Conservation Tillage Information Center comes to my mind, which is run by an outside organization. And we do help them provide information and once in awhile, people to help them with tillage information. And it's a place where they share information on conservation tillage. And it's a National center, and the ideas are exchanged, and they have an 800 line provided by this outside group. And we work with this outside group in this particular instance.

I'd be glad to explore further with you, ways that we could help in the type of a clearinghouse. As you mentioned in your talk, I hesitate to get Government directly involved in some things, because it seems like people like Ray Buchanan and other volunteer organizations do things much better when Government's hand is not directly involved.

Mr. HALL. I'd like to pursue that with you, Mr. Myers. I again thank you for your time today, and thank you for your statement. And certainly we're excited about your commitment to gleaning and we hope that we can make this more of a national kind of project. There are, I guess, a number of ways we can do this. I look forward to working with you. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MYERS. Well, I thank you, and you have my personal commitment to work with it. As you walk into my office, and you'll find these brochures on my table. I'll leave a few here for people to look at. They talk about gleaning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HALL. Thank you.

The third panel of this afternoon is made up of Susan Arneaud—I hope I'm pronouncing that right, Rev. Ray Buchanan, and Mr. Hershel Smith.

If the three of you will come up, and sit in the three chairs that are in front of the microphone. Ray, why don't you sit in the middle. I understand, that we need to—we're having a problem with the microphones. You need to speak directly into the middle microphones or your testimony cannot be officially taken. So, Ray, after you get done with your testimony, and if we could switch around. Then if there are be questions afterward, try to lean into the microphones. I'm sorry for this inconvenience, but apparently that's the way it was set up.

Rev. Ray Buchanan is the codirector of the Society of St. Andrew, an organization which sponsors both the Potato Project, and the Harvest of Hope. Since 1983, the Potato Project has collected and distributed to organizations serving needy people, approxi-

mately 50 million pounds of potatoes, which otherwise would have been wasted. I would also like to note that Reverend Buchanan is a member of the Select Committee's Private Sector Advisory Board.

Mr. Smith is a potato farmer from Maine, who permits gleaning on his property, once commercial harvesting has occurred. His farming operation covers approximately 6,000 acres. So, we thank you very, very much.

Ms. Arneaud, is the acting human services advisor to Gov. James Blanchard of Michigan.

Ray, would you begin, and then after Mr. Buchanan gets done with his testimony, if we could go to Ms. Arneaud, and Mr. Smith, then we'll proceed with questions. Your prepared statements will be inserted for the record.

Mr. Buchanan.

STATEMENT OF REV. RAY BUCHANAN, CODIRECTOR, SOCIETY OF ST. ANDREW, BIG ISLAND, VA

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you this afternoon.

The Society of St. Andrew began in 1979 as an antihunger ministry. For 3 years, basically all we did was education, trying to inform people what could be done to fight against hunger. It was not until June of 1983, that we actually began trying to actively do something to alleviate hunger.

At that time we started the Potato Project. It came about simply because in one of our hunger workshops, we used some statistics that came from the GAO. In fact, those statistics showed that 20 percent of all the food grown for human consumption is ultimately wasted. That food, if you added it up, would be enough food wasted every year to feed 49 million people. When we used those statistics in the workshop, immediately a farmer in the area contested those statistics, and said that there was no way that American farmers wasted 20 percent of the crop. Because of that, we started a dialogue which when we finished, the farmer agreed that in his area, which was a potato growing area, they did waste an enormous amount of potatoes.

We talked with the farmer and asked if he would donate some of those potatoes that were normally wasted to us, to try to get to a local food bank. He agreed. In fact, we got him to talk to several of his friends and those six farmers on the Eastern Shore of Virginia, told us that in their normal harvest season, they would throw away probably 1 million pounds of potatoes in a 6- to 8-week period. When we started trying to arrange distribution of these potatoes, it became known what we were trying to accomplish, and one person told us of a sweet potato grower in North Carolina that wasted potatoes. And we called him, and when he found out what we were attempting to do, he immediately had sweet potatoes to try to give us.

And so in June 1983, we started working with this sweet potato grower. He gave us 16,000 pounds of nutritious sweet potatoes, but sweet potatoes that were not pretty enough to be marketed. And we distributed them to the food bank in Richmond, VA. That was the start of the Potato Project. What we have found, is just like

you mentioned, and the Deputy Secretary mentioned before me, that the amount of food, perfectly good food that's wasted in this country is staggering in the extreme. We have been trying to distribute mainly potatoes that are not marketable for the last 4 years. Already we have exceeded 53 million pounds of potatoes that we've been able to distribute to agencies working to alleviate hunger.

And to be honest with you, we have barely begun to scratch the surface. There's no way for me to sit here and be able to tell you exactly how much food we could salvage and glean, if the financial resources and the volunteer resources were available. Simply suffice it to say that we have a small staff of six that work out of a converted sheep shed in the mountains of Virginia, and in 4 years time starting from ground zero, if you will, we've been able to establish a network that includes hundreds of farmers and over hundreds of distribution agencies all across the United States, all interested in gleaning and getting this food that's otherwise wasted into the hands of the poor and the hungry.

So far, we've been able to do this by ourselves. But we see the potential to be so much greater. That's why I'm excited and pleased to be able to testify today. Because if the public would be aware of what is possible with gleaning, the amount of food that could be salvaged for the hungry would be greatly magnified. Most of the potatoes and produce that we have salvaged, we consider we have gleaned. But the way we have gleaned it is not directly out of the fields, but in the grading process. When potatoes or other produce is harvested, it goes through a grading process to make sure it is pretty enough for the American consumer. A great deal of produce is wasted at this stage of marketing, simply because the American consumer has been taught that if the produce is not perfect, they shouldn't buy it. So we get potatoes that are too small, potatoes that are funny shaped, potatoes that have been nicked or cut during harvest, or potatoes that have been sunburned. That's simply a slight green discoloration to the skin. These potatoes are perfectly nutritious, but they're not marketable. Potato farmers are forced to throw away and discard millions of pounds of these potatoes every year, because there's no market for them.

And it's not only the potato industry, but all produce is basically the same process is undergone. As we found more farmers willing to work with us, more of this produce can be salvaged. This is where the majority of produce that the Society of St. Andrew's Potato Project has come from.

But following up on the specific gleaning, going into fields after harvest, for the last 3 years we have been taking high school seniors, volunteers, who spend a week of their summer, they'll go out and for a week, they'll spend a half a day gleaning the fields after harvest. Going into the fields and picking up potatoes or other produce that's left behind after harvest, and then distributing this produce locally. As you mentioned in your testimony earlier, it's unbelievable the amount of produce that's there to be gleaned and salvaged if people are made aware of it. In a normal week we can take 25 to 50 young people and they'll easily glean 70,000 to 75,000 pounds of otherwise wasted potatoes, just picking them up one at a time.

After 4 years, we still know that we have just begun. The amount of food that's out there that's being wasted every day, is enough food, if we could glean it, to feed the majority of the hungry people in this country. My own belief is that there's more than enough food being wasted in our country to feed all the hungry people in this country. That's why I'm so adamant about getting more people involved in the gleaning and salvage of otherwise wasted produce.

In that spirit there are few recommendations that the Society of St. Andrew has for the Select Committee on Hunger and especially this task force. We feel that it would be a very positive step if a national gleaning clearinghouse could be set up. In 4 years we have established a network of considerable size. But that network is the only thing that allows us to distribute produce, but we know that there are a great number of distribution centers and agencies of which we're not aware, and it's extremely difficult for small agencies, especially if they're not located in large urban areas, to be able to network sufficiently and move all the produce that's available. A national clearinghouse would be a networking tool that would have enormous benefit for the gleaning on a national scale.

At the same time, such a clearinghouse would allow the publicity to take place, that's necessary to get more people involved. This is another one of our recommendations, that a publicity campaign be instituted to get gleaning instituted more on a national basis. You've done a tremendous amount of work in the State of Ohio, and I think the benefits of that will be seen. Campaigns like that, and campaigns in every State would be helpful, but even on a national basis where you could get not only growers and civic and religious organizations involved, but also the transportation industry. The largest cost that we have in distributing otherwise wasted produce, is the cost of transporting this produce from the grower to the distribution agency. With the right amount of publicity, I'm sure there are a number of transportation groups that would like to get involved on a volunteer basis.

Another recommendation that we have, and this will be my final recommendation, is that I think it would be extremely beneficial to have some sort of a gleaning handbook published, a gleaning manual, to help local groups get organized in a step-by-step fashion, so that they would be able to start salvaging produce in their own area.

I'd just like to finish by saying there's no need for any American citizen to go to bed hungry. There's enough food produced in this country, there's enough food wasted in this country so that every American could be fed a nutritionally balanced diet. This is the aim of the Society of St. Andrew. We applaud the efforts of the Select Committee on Hunger and what they have been doing to bring hunger to the attention of the American public. And we're willing and anxious to work in every way possible with the committee to make it possible for all Americans to have the diet they deserve.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Buchanan appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 28.]

Mr. HALL. Thank you, Mr. Buchanan.

Ms. Arneaud.

STATEMENT OF SUSAN ARNEAUD, ACTING HUMAN SERVICES ADVISOR TO THE GOVERNOR, STATE OF MICHIGAN

Ms. ARNEAUD. You pronounced my name exactly right. That's unusual.

Mr. HALL. I had some help.

Ms. ARNEAUD. I'm very pleased to be here, and to be invited to offer testimony on behalf of Governor Blanchard about gleaning initiatives in the State of Michigan.

Michigan is a State of agricultural abundance and variety, and a people with a tradition of generosity. These factors have led to a natural partnership between the growers, packers, processors, and distributors of food in our State, and the hundreds of large and small emergency food provider organizations. As a result, Michigan has many programs that have successful experience with gleaning.

We're proud that one innovative senior gleaning project has recently won a Golden Apple Award. A gleaning team of 10 seniors made 13 trips during one season to glean blueberries, apples, and corn. They gleaned 12,000 pounds of food, 6 tons of food. However successful Michigan's individual and regional programs have been, we recognize the need to develop a statewide system to identify surplus food and to coordinate the distribution to public and private food programs. In his 1987 state of the State address, Governor Blanchard made the commitment to develop a coordinated system for screening and distributing surplus raw and processed food to Michigan emergency food centers, using both private donations and State emergency food program funding.

The establishment of a statewide distribution network is, we believe, one of the essential components necessary to allow the best use of gleaning in our State. I think a national network is a good idea as well.

In addition to this network, which is now in the process of development, Michigan has put in place three other interactive initiatives which we identified as necessary to expand and facilitate the use of gleaning. One is a State tax credit for farmers who allow gleaning. Current State law allows farmers to deduct 20 percent of the fair market value of the product at the time it was gleaned. This tax credit is available for gleaning of an unharvested crop, as well as gleaning that takes place after harvest.

On July 10, 1987, Governor Blanchard signed into law Act 110 of the Public Acts of 1987. This law protects growers and U-pick farmers from liability for injuries to gleaners unless the injury was the result of a condition which involved unknown, unreasonable risk of harm, and the grower neither notified nor took reasonable care to make the condition safe. We believe that the provision of immunity will make gleaning more attractive to more farmers, particularly in the light of the availability of a tax credit. These statutes can work together, but promotion of gleaning is pivotal to deriving the most benefit from the incentives in the network and in both statutes.

For example, we need to publicize the tax credit to growers and gleaners. We need to make growers aware of the protection that's

afforded by the new statute, which limits liability. We need to inform agricultural producers about the benefits of gleaning for themselves, public service organizations and the needy. Volunteer gleaners need to be trained and made sensitive to the concerns of growers. Technical assistance for gleaners, perhaps in the form of a pamphlet, needs to be made available.

In summary, Michigan's gleaning initiative is a broad based, bipartisan strategy that consists of a tax credit, statutory immunity, promotion of gleaning statewide by the means of publicity, training and technical assistance, and a coordinating mechanism through which public and private partners cooperate. The purpose of our gleaning initiative is to capture the food resources before they are wasted and channel them into feeding programs. We believe our State initiatives are working and they hold great promise for the future.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Governor Blanchard, I again want to thank you for the invitation to provide the Select Committee on Hunger with some information about Michigan's gleaning initiatives, and I stand ready to answer any questions that you may have.

Mr. HALL. Thank you, Ms. Arneaud. Thank you very much for your testimony.

[Material submitted by Ms. Arneaud appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 44.]

Mr. HALL. Now we'll hear from Mr. Smith.

STATEMENT OF HERSHEL SMITH, POTATO FARMER, BLAINE, ME

Mr. SMITH. I'm Hershel Smith from Maine, Mr. Chairman.

In your introduction, you said I farmed 6,000 acres, which is not correct. I may own 6,000 acres, but I farm about 3,500, the balance of which is woods, land, and swamp. So, I set the record straight there.

I'm from Blaine, ME. I am a grower and a packer, and shipper of vegetables including potatoes, broccoli, lettuce, cabbage, spinach, squash, and cauliflower. Our shipping season for potatoes extends from about August 20 to July 1. It's a storage crop. New storage technology is now available to extend our potato season to 12 months, and I expect that that will be done in the very new future. The other vegetables are more perishable. Their marketing is from July 15 to about October 15 or 20, or freeze-up time.

I became involved in the supplying of potatoes to the needy through the Society of St. Andrew in November 1983, and have continued to participate in the program since that time. According to a quick research of my records, I supplied 67 trailer loads of potatoes in the program of 1983–84, 62 in 1984–85, 92 in 1985–86, and 79 in the 1986–87 years.

We calculate a trailer load of potatoes at 1,000 50-pound bags, which is conservative, it would make a total of 15 million pounds of potatoes over the period of 4 years. And figuring 8 ounce servings, that would feed about 30 million people. When you bring it close to home, that would feed every person in the State of Maine 30 meals.

In addition to the Potato Program, I also allow the local people to glean my fields of vegetables after I've harvested that which is

economically feasible. The amount available for gleaning of these vegetables varies greatly from vegetable to vegetable and from day to day, depending on the growing conditions and the market prices. Being in a rural area, the amount of produce available for gleaning far exceeds the demand. We just don't have the people. The balance left is worked back into the soil, or hauled to the dump, or fed to cattle.

As a farmer, I'm not looking for tax writeoffs. I'm in the position of hundreds of other farmers in the United States with a surplus problem of less than No. 1 grade unmarketable produce. If I were to have hauled that 15 million pounds of potatoes to the dump, I would have created a serious environmental problem, and several thousand dollars expense bulldozing it under, not to mention the wrath of neighbors for miles around on account of the odor.

There are literally hundreds of millions of pounds of good usable produce in this country that go to waste every month. Only last month, I understand that the California Potato Growers plowed under several hundred acres of good potatoes simply because it was not economically feasible to harvest and pack them. Does it not make good sense to try and get some of this product to the truly needy? The Society of St. Andrew should be congratulated in taking the initiative to organize such a commendable program and to distribute these commodities. But they and others like them need help. They have merely scratched the surface. Much more needs to be done.

Now a word of caution. In considering expansion of these types of programs careful safeguards should be in place to prevent the escalating cost of middlemen, such as brokerage and handling fees.

Safeguards should be instituted against abuses, such as reselling a product that's supposed to be given away.

Safeguards to prevent the taking of legitimate customers away from a struggling business, or a Ma & Pa corner store.

And safeguards against waste of deterioration once the product is delivered to a distribution center.

With that, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to testify before this committee. I hope you are successful in structuring some sort of a practical, workable program of bypassing the very expensive normal channels of distribution, and delivering some of this wasted food to the truly needy. It is long overdue in this country.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Smith appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 48.]

Mr. HALL. Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith, how did you get involved with gleaning? What was the motivating factor that got you involved in this?

Mr. SMITH. I'm a christian, and I live by the Bible as my bread of life. And I got a call from the Society of St. Andrew in November 1983. We had the product, we have a bag factory up there that agreed to donate the bags, it was just a natural. It fell together. I'm just sorry that it isn't larger participation. We need more distribution points. Like, for example, we put very little potatoes into Boston. It's right on our doorstep. There's no one there that's coordinating the effort to handle them. We probably put in two trail-

ers a week into Patterson, NJ. They've got a good distribution center.

Mr. HALL. With respect to the gleaners that glean your fields, other than potatoes, do you have a liability problem? Has that ever come up?

Mr. SMITH. Well, it's something that we have to consider. We have not had any problem with it so far. Up in our country, it's very rural. The number of people that come into our fields to glean our vegetable crop is kind of a minor thing. It's certainly something that would have to be considered on a nationwide basis.

Mr. HALL. Ms. Arneaud, as I was listening to your testimony, you were talking about a kind of thing in Michigan as we were suggesting in the country; that is, a clearinghouse. I don't know if I'm putting words in your mouth, but a kind of clearinghouse in Michigan for gleaning, is that what you're talking about?

Ms. ARNEAUD. That's one of the ways that it can work, yes. In Michigan, the process for the distribution of surplus food is just being developed. There are a couple of models we've been considering for setting up the system.

One of them is the clearinghouse concept, involving a central place where people could call to say that they have crops available. The clearinghouse would be able to coordinate the gathering and the distribution of food.

Another model that we are considering would be with a declaration that a commodity was in surplus. The declaration would allow an interested producer to offer that surplus for purchase at low cost to organizations that do feeding programs.

We're leaning toward the first or possibly a combination of the two. I didn't get here in time to listen to your testimony. I'd be very interested in hearing the concept that you have outlined to see if it is a strategy that we could use.

It's been pointed out that a food distribution network will involve public and private sectors, State and local, and National Government, charitable organizations, and growers and processors, among others. It's a very broad group. It's difficult to conceptualize the method that will best draw those folks together. We're still searching for it.

Mr. HALL. How much gleaning goes on in Michigan? I mean, is it widespread, or segments, or certain sections of the State, or what?

Ms. ARNEAUD. I knew you were going to ask that question, and I wish I could answer it. I do know that there are many very successful projects across Michigan gleaning different kinds of commodities. Some gleaning occurs in the packing sheds, there is gleaning of windfalls, like apples, as well as gleaning of fields and orchards. There are projects where, in addition to gleaning, they give workshops to teach canning and preserving. They glean and process the food themselves.

I did check to determine the extent of gleaning in Michigan. I know that it's widespread. The absense of a network, however, makes a definitive answer impossible; I don't know.

Mr. HALL. Thank you very much.

I was wondering, Mr. Smith, could you change with Mr. Buchanan? It is an inconvenience, and I'm sorry that you've had to lean

over there, Ms. Arneaud, while answering a question, but that will save time and trouble.

Mr. Buchanan, I noticed in your statement that you distribute potatoes to almost every State.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That's correct. Currently we are working in 47 States and the District of Columbia. And have also made several shipments outside the United States. But about 99 percent of what we do is in the United States.

Mr. HALL. That's got to be a tremendous logistical problem. Apparently you've worked it out. Can you tell us some of the problems you've encountered?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well basically the only difficulties we've encountered is locating distribution centers around the country. It's very hard for a small organization such as ours to locate agencies working with the hungry in Los Angeles, or Kalamazoo, or Boston. We have relied heavily on the religious network, working through churches and synagogues, and church organizations. But that's limited. And with a small staff it's very difficult to finding all the organizations that are out there that need food. That's where we feel a national clearinghouse would be of great benefit. Just making the connection between the grower or the supplier of the produce, and those agencies that desperately need the food to feed the hungry people.

Mr. HALL. Is there a role for the Federal Government? We talked about a national clearinghouse, but in your opinion is there a role for the Federal Government?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think there is a role for the Federal Government, but it's a limited role. I think a beneficial role for the Federal Government, in my estimation, would be in helping set up a national clearinghouse. Maybe in publication of a generic gleaning manual, in helping get the publicity necessary to encourage more groups in every locality to be able to start gleaning and salvage programs.

I don't see a large bureaucracy as being necessary or even helpful. But just in getting the ball rolling on a national basis, it would be of great worth, I think, to have the Federal Government help.

Mr. HALL. I have some other questions, that I'd like to submit to you a little bit later on by writing. If I could I'd like some answers from the three of you. I sincerely appreciate the testimony, your answers, and the tremendous work that you're doing. And it's gratifying to be with you and listen to the part of this. But I am very excited about what you are doing, and thank you for it.

We have Mr. Gilman here, who's one of our leading proponents of the domestic end here in Congress, and I was wondering if you might have any questions?

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask the panelists, and I want to commend them for their initiatives in this area. Are there any gleaning efforts in other nations around the world? Are you aware of any?

Ms. ARNEAUD. Not that I know of.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. GILMAN. Is gleaning limited to just a few States in our Nation today? How many States are involved in gleaning? You may have covered it in your testimony, and I came in a little late.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the broadest sense of gleaning, I think most States are involved to one degree or another. Gleaning either from the fields, after harvest or gleaning from packing sheds. I think the concept of gleaning is growing, but could grow much faster with proper publicity and encouragement.

Mr. GILMAN. Has there been any—you mentioned a need for publication. Has there been any publication put out at all by any of the groups that could be utilized?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There's no publication available to my knowledge at this time.

Mr. GILMAN. Have you made a request of the Department of Agriculture to put out some information on gleaning?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, sir, not at this time.

Mr. GILMAN. Well, that might be a role for the Federal Government, Mr. Hall, that we take it up with the Department of Agriculture to at least provide some basic information about gleaning. It certainly sounds worthwhile.

Mr. Buchanan, you have some charts attached to your testimony, and I was just wondering, on this distribution report, how many agencies are involved in this distribution that you've attached to your statement?

Mr. BUCHANAN. As you can see from the report, I will simply say hundreds. At this time I don't have a specific count. I could go through and count them.

Mr. GILMAN. And this all gleaning produce?

Mr. BUCHANAN. This is all agencies that have distributed produce that we have salvaged from produce growers that would otherwise be throwing this produce away. And the number of agencies that you see on this list is not the entire list. This is only agencies that we have actively distributed produce through. There are a great number of agencies, at least half this many again, who have requested produce from us, but we have not been able to get produce to them, either because of their isolated location, or the amount of produce they could use is too small for us to help.

For example, we work primarily with produce that has been graded unacceptable for market. So we deal in tractor-trailer loads, 45,000 to 50,000 pounds at a time. And there are a lot of distribution agencies that cannot handle that amount of produce at one time. That again, is where local gleaning agencies would be so beneficial because the amounts gleaned would be small enough that it would work right into a smaller distribution agency.

Mr. GILMAN. Now, on your chart you show year total and then project total. How long does the project go when you say project total?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, that's since the inception of the project in June 1983.

Mr. GILMAN. I see.

All of these have their start around 1983?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, sir. They've had their start at different times. When we started in 1983, we were working just with several agencies, but as the word has gotten out that we have produce available, agencies contact us asking us if we can supply produce to them. A good example of that is the State of Iowa. If you would look at the distribution report, you'll notice that Iowa has a quite

extensive list of agencies. At least a dozen of those agencies were added in 1986. We worked primarily with four distribution agencies in Iowa up until 1986. Three of those were food banks, and one was a Native American Reservation. We worked with them from 1983 through 1985. In 1986, at least a dozen new agencies in Iowa contacted us and said we heard that you have potatoes available. Can we please have some. And so most of those agencies in Iowa were added in 1986.

The need for food seems to be growing according to the requests that we get. And as agencies ask us for food, we simply put them on the list, and if we can get food to them, we do. So our list is growing every day.

Mr. GILMAN. Do each of your groups, and I address to all of the panelists, do you have some little brochure you've put together on your gleaning efforts?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We have a wide variety of brochures of one variety or another, especially to help us with the fundraising, and just spread the word about what can be done. We have several brochures available.

Mr. GILMAN. We would welcome having copies, the committee would welcome having copies of your brochures. Maybe we can take some of those and urge our Agricultural Department to put out a general information pamphlet on gleaning.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I'd be glad to supply copies of those to the committee.

Ms. ARNEAUD. So would I.

Mr. GILMAN. What are some of the larger nonprofit organizations, the voluntary organizations that are engaged in gleaning in the country? What are some of the more prominent ones, besides yourselves?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Second Harvest Food Bank Network, of course, is a major distribution network of salvaged food. They distribute primarily, processed food. It's very difficult for them to distribute produce because of the perishability and the logistics involved. But in the actual gleaning process, probably the largest group gleaning right now, is the Senior Gleaners in California. That's a statewide organization that's having tremendous success and a long history. I'm sure there's some in Michigan as well.

Mr. GILMAN. What about in the northeast, any gleaning, large gleaning groups in the northeast?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There are none of which I'm aware.

Mr. GILMAN. Is there any association of voluntary gleaners at all?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not at this point, but again, that's where a national clearinghouse or something of that type would be extremely helpful, just getting all the different groups together. There's three legs to the stool that have to be put in place for gleaning to be successful. There has to be the grower who will allow gleaning. There has to be the voluntary agency who will actually do the work, and there has to be the distribution agency, and you have to get all three of those organizations together in every locality for it to work. And sometimes it would just help to have a larger overarching agency to make sure that happens.

Mr. GILMAN. To establish a national clearinghouse, you wouldn't need any Federal agency involved, would you?

Mr. BUCHANAN. At this point I hesitate to answer that. Maybe one of the other panelists could help. I see that it would probably be beneficial to have some Federal help just because of easing the workload. It's awfully hard for small voluntary agencies to take something on of that scope and make it work.

Mr. GILMAN. Any of the other panelists want to comment? Do you really need the Federal Government to get involved to get a national clearinghouse going?

Ms. ARNEAUD. I would think that the Federal Government would need to be involved to get a national clearinghouse going, for the same reason that the State needs to get involved to get a statewide clearinghouse going.

There needs to be an umbrella, a way of coordinating and bringing it all together. It would seem that the Federal Government would be a good place for that coordination to occur.

Mr. GILMAN. Well, I want to again commend our good chairman for bringing about this hearing, and for bringing to our attention, the attention of the committee, the good work of those of you who are involved in gleaning. And I'm certain that while gleaning is as old as the hunger problem itself, what is new to us is the massive amount of food that does go to waste, and how you're attempting to distribute some of that food. And I hope that our committee can be of some help in fostering even further efforts of gleaning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank our panelists.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Buchanan, let me ask one last question.

If I was in Dayton, Ohio, and I wanted some potatoes, and I call you, how do I get the potatoes?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Basically, what we do is we find out, make sure that you're a tax exempt, nonprofit organization working with the needy and the hungry, and once we establish that, we find a grower located as close to you as possible, and when he has produce that he would normally throw away, that he wants to donate to us, we see that that produce is sent to you instead. We pay the cost of the transportation of that. So that's where our largest cost is, is in transporting it. We also pay any cost that the grower incurs in giving us that produce, because there is the cost of bags, the cost of additional labor, and we feel if the grower will simply donate the produce, we'll take care of whatever cost is incurred.

So basically, a phone call to us will put you on our list, and anytime we have food in your area, we'll try to see that you get it.

Mr. HALL. Well, thank you very much for coming. We have a rollcall on, and we have about 10 minutes, left. Your testimony, as I said before, was excellent, and I just appreciate the work that you're doing.

Thank you very much.

The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 2:25 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. TONY P. HALL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO COMMEND THE COMMITTEE FOR HOLDING HEARINGS ON THE SUBJECT OF GLEANING, A SUBJECT IN WHICH I HOLD A KEEN INTEREST AND HAVE A LITTLE FIRST-HAND EXPERIENCE.

THERE IS NOTHING NEW ABOUT GLEANING. IT HAS BEEN PRACTICED SINCE ANCIENT TIMES. IN ESSENCE, GLEANING IS GATHERING CROPS LEFT IN THE FIELDS AFTER THE HARVEST AND DONATING THEM TO THE HUNGRY.

RIGHT NOW BEANS AND CORN ARE BEING GLEANED IN DAYTON, OHIO. ALMOST EVERY DAY, LEFTOVER CROPS ARE PICKED BY VOLUNTEERS AND DONATED TO NEEDY INDIVIDUALS WHO RECEIVE FOOD FROM OVER 60 FOOD PANTRIES IN THE DAYTON AREA. EVEN BEFORE LAST WEEK'S KICK-OFF OF OUR 2ND ANNUAL GLEANING EVENT, VOLUNTEERS HAD COLLECTED 9500 POUNDS OF EDIBLE FOOD.

I HARDLY NEED TO TELL THE DOMESTIC TASK FORCE ON HUNGER ABOUT THE HUNGER NEEDS HERE IN THE UNITED STATES. YOU KNOW, BETTER THAN I, THE OVERWHELMING STATISTICS ABOUT NUMBERS OF PEOPLE WHOSE BASIC HUNGER NEEDS GO UNMET.

ACCORDING TO THE OHIO HUNGER TASK FORCE, THERE ARE 1.5 MILLION PEOPLE LIVING BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL IN MY OWN STATE OF OHIO. LAST YEAR 1.9 MILLION OHIOANS RECEIVED FOOD STAMPS. ACCORDING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OHIO HAS THE FOURTH LARGEST FOOD STAMP PROGRAM IN THE COUNTRY.

I BECAME INTERESTED IN GLEANING IN CONJUNCTION WITH MY WORK ON WASTED FOOD, AND MY ONGOING INVOLVEMENT IN HUNGER PROJECTS IN DAYTON, OHIO. BURIED

IN THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE'S (GAU) REPORT ON WASTED FOOD, IS THE FIGURE THAT 60 MILLION TONS OF FOOD ROTS ON THE FIELDS, UNPICKED AND UNEATEN.

60 MILLION TONS! EVEN IF A FRACTION OF THAT FOOD COULD BE SALVAGED AND DISTRIBUTED TO THE NEEDY, WE WOULD GO A LONG WAY TOWARD HELPING TO FEED THE HUNGRY OF THIS NATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN I WOULD LIKE TO REPORT ON HOW WE ARE USING GLEANING TO HELP HALT HUNGER IN OHIO. LAST YEAR I STARTED A PROJECT WITH OUR FOOD BANK, THE EMERGENCY RESOURCE BANK (ERB) OF THE DAYTON CHAPTER OF THE RED CROSS, TO GLEAN THE FIELDS AROUND DAYTON. IN COORDINATION WITH ERB'S EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR KIPRA HOLLEY AND WAREHOUSE DIRECTOR JEANNE JACKSON, WE ORGANIZED VOLUNTEERS, LINED UP FARMS, AND ARRANGED FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE FOOD. THIS WAS A FOLLOWUP TO LEGISLATION I INTRODUCED IN THE LAST CONGRESS WHICH BECAME PART OF THE 1985 FOOD SECURITY ACT TO ENCOURAGE GLEANING OF THE FIELDS.

ERB REGULARLY DISTRIBUTES FOOD TO THE HUNGRY THROUGH THE FOOD PANTRIES THAT SERVE DONATED FOOD. RARELY, HOWEVER, DO THESE FOOD PANTRIES HAVE ACCESS TO FRESH PRODUCE. AN ELDERLY PERSON TOLD ME THAT SHE WAS ASTONISHED AT HOW BIG AND JUICY THE GLEANED STRAWBERRIES WERE-- STRAWBERRIES THAT SHE SAID THAT SHE WOULD NEVER BE ABLE TO BUY.

LAST YEAR'S GLEANING PROJECT WAS STARTED FROM SCRATCH. WE HAD NO IDEA OF WHAT TO EXPECT. ALL WE HAD WAS ENTHUSIASM!

THE RESPONSE WAS OVERWHELMING. HUNDREDS OF VOLUNTEERS CONTRIBUTED OVER 3,000 HOURS OF TIME. A TOTAL OF 37 DIFFERENT CHURCH, CIVIC, FOOD RELIEF, AND SCHOOL GROUPS PROVIDED VOLUNTEERS. THE FOOD WAS PICKED, STORED, AND DELIVERED IN A MATTER OF DAYS.

WE TOOK IN ALMOST 21 TONS OF FOOD. THIS INCLUDED TOMATOES, BEANS, SWEET CORN, SQUASH, BROCCOLI, CABBAGE, SWISS CHARD, WATERMELONS AND CANTALOUPES, SWEET POD PEAS, APPLES, CUCUMBERS, PINTO BEANS, ZUCCHINI, MUSTARD GREENS, CAULIFLOWER, BEETS, LEAF LETTUCE, PUMPKINS, AND ONE AND ONE-HALF TONS OF STRAWBERRIES. BETWEEN APRIL AND SEPTEMBER OF 1986, ERB SUPPLEMENTED 70,000 FOOD REQUESTS WITH NUTRITIOUS GLEANED FOOD. AND THAT WAS OUR FIRST YEAR.

LAST WEEK I KICKED OFF THE 2ND ANNUAL GLEANING PROGRAM IN DAYTON. ADD EXPERIENCE TO ENTHUSIASM, AND I THINK WE WILL GET AN EVEN BETTER PROJECT. MY GOAL IS TO DOUBLE THE TONNAGE PICKED LAST YEAR.

ALREADY FARMERS ARE CALLING OFFERING THEIR CROPS. OVER THE WEEKEND A FARMER CALLED AND OFFERED AN ACRE OF SILVER CORN. TWO CHURCHES HAVE ACTUALLY PLANTED ACRES OF BEANS FOR US. THE CITY OF DAYTON IS DONATING NINE ACRES OF CROPS FROM THE COMMUNITY GARDENS. THESE ARE OUTRIGHT DONATIONS, THAT DO NOT REQUIRE PICKING UP LEFTOVERS. GLEANING PROJECTS OFTEN TRIGGER THIS KIND OF GENEROSITY.

THE POTENTIAL FOR GLEANING IS UNLIMITED. IN MAY I HELD A RALLY IN OUR STATE CAPITAL CALLED GLEAN OHIO. SINCE THEN TEN INDIVIDUAL GROUPS HAVE REPORTED GLEANING PROJECTS TO ME. THEY SERVE HUNGER NEEDS ALL OVER THE STATE, INCLUDING COLUMBUS, HAMILTON, XENIA, CINCINNATI, AND THE AKRON-CANTON AREA.

THE TOLEDO SEAGATE FOOD BANK IN TOLEDO, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF ALICE MOSINIAK, GLEANED THIRTY-THREE DIFFERENT CROPS WEIGHING 427,897 POUNDS IN 1986. IN ADDITION, 123,840 EARS OF CORN WERE GLEANED AND DISTRIBUTED.

ALICE MOSINIAK STARTED THE FOOD BANK IN A CLOSET IN ONE OF HER CLASSROOMS WHERE SHE WAS RUNNING A JOBS TRAINING PROGRAM. GLEANING NOW PLAYS AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN HER HUNGER RELIEF EFFORTS.

In Canton, Ohio, the local newspaper, the Repository, works with the Stark County Hunger Task Force, Inc., in the "Food for All" project. The project gathers surplus crops and takes direct donations. Each week the project asks local gardeners to check what is growing and donate all crops not needed. The "Food for All" project keeps lists of people needing gleaners, helps get gleaned food distributed to 14 distribution sites and organizes canning to preserve gleaned food for year round use.

"Food For All 87" began this April. By June nearly 13,000 pounds of food were donated, along with more than 2,000 canning jars.

Gleaning efforts work hand-in-hand with the other excellent hunger projects run by the Task Force to serve Stark County which has been particularly hard-hit by economic decline.

Mr. Chairman, the gleaning projects, large or small, are taking place all over the country. People are getting fed. In Stark County, a marked increase in need is seen in the summer when children are out of school and not getting subsidized meals.

In Hamilton, Ohio, Feed the People, Inc., under the direction of Dr. Jerry E. Williams worked with a local church and three individuals. They gleaned tomatoes, zucchini, beans, greens, grapes, turnips, potatoes, apples, cucumbers, beans and lettuce for their community.

These are a few examples of what is going on in my state. It can, and is being done in other communities.

Senior Gleaners, a senior citizens' group in California harvested more than 2 million pounds of food in 1982, and distributed it to more than 250 charities in northern California. Senior Gleaners also glean unpurchased food from retailers and arrange to have it stored.

GLEANERS, INC. OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA COLLECTS 400,000 POUNDS OF FOOD EACH MONTH FROM 18 SUPERMARKETS, 69 WHOLESALE COMPANIES, A U.S. AIR FORCE BASE, 3 HOTELS AND 3 CATERING COMPANIES, THE LAST COUNT I HAD!

I HAVE ENCOURAGED GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS TO HELP REDUCE HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES AND ABROAD. BUT THERE IS A LIMIT TO HOW MUCH THE GOVERNMENT CAN DO. THE PEOPLE MUST BE READY TO SUPPORT HUNGER RELIEF EFFORTS WITH THEIR OWN WORK. WE, IN THE GOVERNMENT SECTOR, SHOULD PLAY A SUPPORT ROLE BY HELPING THESE PRIVATE SECTOR GROUPS SPRING UP, AND GET IN TOUCH WITH ONE ANOTHER.

IT IS COST-EFFECTIVE FOR US AND IT CAN BE DONE WITHOUT SOME MASSIVE GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY.

WE SHOULD FIND OUT EXACTLY WHAT IS OUT THERE TO GLEAN AND WHO IS DOING WHAT. WE, IN THE GOVERNMENT, SHOULD TAKE A LOOK AT THE POTENTIAL FOR GLEANING AND HELP MAKE IT POSSIBLE.

GLEANED FOOD IS FREE. IT IS THERE FOR THE TAKING. THE ONLY EXPENSE INVOLVED IS COORDINATING VOLUNTEER PICKERS, AND ARRANGING TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE.

IT IS GOOD FOOD. OFTEN THE ONLY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A PEACH LEFT ON THE TREE AND THE ONE YOU BUY IN THE STORE IS THAT ONE LEFT IN THE TREE IS THE WRONG SIZE.

GLEANING IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE IT IS DONE AT THE GRASSROOTS LEVEL. AS ONE WHO HAS PERSONALLY GLEANED, I CAN ATTEST TO THE FACT THAT THERE IS A FELLOWSHIP OF PEOPLE WORKING TOGETHER. IT IS HEARTENING TO SEE A WELFARE RECIPIENT WORKING SIDE-BY-SIDE WITH A BUSINESSMAN, STUDENT OR SENIOR CITIZEN.

THE GOVERNMENT CAN HELP. LAWS CAN BE PASSED TO REMOVE BARRIERS TO GLEANING. GOVERNMENTS CAN HELP BY OFFERING INCENTIVES TO GLEAN. BUT THE SUCCESS OF GLEANING RESTS ON THE PEOPLE DOING IT.

I AM CONVINCED THERE IS THE COMMITMENT, THE DEDICATION, AND CONCERN FOR HUNGER OUT THERE TO MAKE WIDESPREAD GLEANING A REALITY. WE, IN THE GOVERNMENT, SHOULD HELP ENCOURAGE IT.

FINALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO SUBMIT FOR THE RECORD A COPY OF A TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MANUAL ON GLEANING PUT OUT BY THE SECOND HARVEST NATIONAL FOODBANK NETWORK. IT IS AN EXCELLENT PIECE ON HOW TO ORGANIZE AND RUN A GLEANING PROJECT.

###

Responses to Questions for Peter Myers, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture

questions submitted by hon. tony p. hall

Question. How can USDA serve as liaison between the agencies that have information on vegetable and fruit production and community or private groups that want to glean?

Answer. We would suggest that the local agencies wanting fruit and vegetable supplies contact their State Department of Agriculture to determine the who, what, and where questions with respect to supply availability. In addition, at that level, community and private groups can communicate with the County Agriculture Extension Office. County Agriculture Agents (advisors) and home demonstration agents are in the best position to direct contacts for locally produced supplies.

Additional Information Supplied by Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA

We believe that Federal marketing order committees, which exist for a variety of fruits and vegetables, might in some instances be an appropriate point of contact for community or private groups which want to glean. Members of these committees, usually representing both producers and handlers, are appointed by the Secretary and make recommendations to the Secretary about the administration of their respective marketing orders. Since marketing order committees represent all producers of a given commodity for which a marketing order exists in State or region, we see the committees as appropriate forums for community and private groups to contact for gleaning opportunities.

Apart from limitations of liability and the need for specialized equipment or training, for example, raisins, prunes, spearmint oil, olives, and dates, operations would be subject to any applicable regulation. For some commodities, marketing orders currently provide exemption from regulations for on-the-farm sales, minimum quantity sales or charitable purposes. For other commodities, there are no such exemptions. Marketing order committees can provide information on such regulations.

Marketing order committees exist for the following fruits and vegetables:

Florida oranges, grapefruits, tangerines, and tangelos
Texas oranges and grapefruits
California-Arizona navel oranges
California-Arizona Valencia oranges
California-Arizona lemons
Florida limes
Florida avocados
California nectarines
California pears, plums, and peaches
Georgia peaches
Colorado peaches
California kiwifruit
Washington peaches
Washington apricots
Washington sweet cherries
Washington-Oregon prunes
California desert grapes
California Tokay grapes
Oregon-Washington-California winter pears
Hawaiian papayas
Cranberries
Washington-Oregon Bartlett pears
California olives
Idaho-Eastern Oregon potatoes
Washington potatoes
Oregon-California potatoes
Colorado Irish potatoes
Virgina-North Carolina potatoes
Idaho-Eastern Oregon onions
Texas onions
Texas tomatoes
Florida tomatoes
Florida celery
Texas lettuce
Texas melons
California almonds
Oregon-Washington filberts
California walnuts
Far West spearmint oil
California dates
California raisins
California dried prunes

Question. In a 1977 report of food waste, the General Accounting Office recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture review opportunities for encouraging charitable donations of food that would otherwise be wasted. What actions has the Department taken in response to this recommendation?

Answer. USDA believes that in most instances opportunities for donating excess food are best known and often can be spotted only by people on the scene at the local level. Therefore, we have not established any formal mechanisms to marry producers with those who wish to distribute excess food. However, USDA does offer assistance and advice to those who are interested in donating or distributing food and who do not know how to set up the necessary arrangements.

Activities involving the use of donable farm products for gleaning or distribution through food banks almost always occur at the local level. In California, for example, county agricultural farm advisors act as clearinghouses for both the farmers who have surplus food to donate and the people in need of the food.

Also, the California Conservation Corp. can be called on to harvest abandoned crops for donation to food banks when gleaners or harvesters are not available. These are just some of the actions taken to make farm surpluses available to the needy.

Question. There is no current estimate on how much food is wasted annually in this country. New estimates have the potential of increasing the awareness of the food waste problem and resulting in the development of more ways in which the food needs of the poor might be met through greater use of discarded foods. What role can USDA play on providing this information?

Answer. The General Accounting Office estimated in a 1977 report that about 20 percent of America's food supply goes to waste each year during harvesting, storage, transportation, and processing. This information has been used widely by food banks in efforts to solicit food, cash contributions, and inkind assistance and was noted in the Report of the President's Taskforce on Food Assistance. Between 4 to 5 percent is wholesale/retail loss, including products that are not sold because they are mislabeled, slightly damaged, or suffer from some cosmetic defect even through the food is still edible.

While USDA could produce a more up-to-date estimate of the level of food waste, we don't believe it would differ significantly from 20 percent. More importantly, the point is not whether the level of food waste is 15 or 25 percent, but that it is still large and constitutes a valuable source of food for low-income persons.

Question. What is viewed by the administration as the proper relationship between the Federal Government and the private network of charitable food providers with respect to meeting the nutrition needs of the poor?

Answer. We wholeheartedly encourage the efforts of charitable organizations and the private sector to help provide food assistance for the needly.

The Food Stamp Program, the main Federal food assistance program, assists low-income Americans in obtaining a nutritious diet. Other Federal food assistance programs, such as the National School Lunch Program, the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), and the Nutrition Program for the Elderly, provide groups at risk of poor nutrition with additional food assistance. In 1987 the Federal Government will spend over $19 billion on domestic food assistance.

The efforts of the private sector and charitable organizations supplement the array of Federal programs. It is difficult for any Federal program to form a perfect fit with the needs in every community in the country. Private sector and charitable organizations are able to adapt to the special needs of their communities.

Question. Gleaning organizations are confronted with a series of obstacles which limit their activities. Some of these relate to the liability of contributors with respect to food safety and accidents to volunteers on their property; the need for vehicles to transport volunteers and collected goods; and the need for storage facilities for goods that are not readily distributed. How can the Government assist in alleviating these obstacles?

Answer. The type of obstacles referenced in the question are often raised when donations of product are discussed. Laws vary from State to State and sometimes amongst local jurisdictions within a State. Accordingly, it is not an area that can be addressed at the national level. Instead, it must be addressed at the local operational level. Local food centers, gleaning organizations, and other charitable organizations that distribute donated food should be in contact with their State Department of Agriculture as well as their State and local Agriculture Extension Service who in turn can place these organizations in touch with State farm and grower organizations who are in the best position to find applicable answers to the specific problems posed.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REV. RAY A. BUCHANAN, CODIRECTOR, SOCIETY OF ST. ANDREW, BIG ISLAND, VA

Mr. Chairman, members of the task force, and collegues, I am Ray A. Buchanan, CoDirector of the Society of St. Andrew, a small anti-hunger organization, headquartered in Big Island, Virginia. I consider it a privilage to appear before you today to testify concerning the experience of the Society of St. Andrew in the salvage of otherwise wasted agricultural surplus, and the proper distribution of that surplus to the hungry of our nation.

The Society of St. Andrew currently operates two extremely successful programs, both targeted at the elimination of food waste. Both, the Potato Project (begun June 1983), and the Harvest of Hope (begun July 1985), are proof that there is the possibility of salvaging vast amounts of normally wasted produce. The success of these programs in channelling this otherwise wasted produce to the wide variety of agencies in need of additional food sources for their client populations offers additional possibilities for an even greater surplus food distribution network.

Hunger is real in the United States. And it is far more than a national tragedy. It is an obscenity. Hunger anywhere is tragic, but it is especially reprehensible in the midst of a nation whose affluence is the talk of the world.

FOOD WASTE

Food waste is one of the major causes contributing to hunger. In the United States the majority of this food waste is

unnecessary. The Society of St. Andrew's experience has shown that there is an almost unbelievable amount of good food wasted because of cosmetic deficiencies.

Tremendous amounts of perfectly nutritious produce never gets consumed. Thousands of tons of potatoes and other produce get thrown away every year because it is not pretty enough for the American consumer. The Society of St. Andrew is waging a war against this waste, and against the hunger to which it contributes.

There is no such thing as an ugly potato to a mother whose children are hungry. Yet in our country, where the numbers of hungry continue to grow larger, there are literally millions of pounds of ugly potatoes being dumped to rot.

These potatoes are hauled away by the dumptruck load because they are not perfect enough to meet the grading standards demanded by the average American consumer. Some are too small. Some are oddly shaped. Some have become slightly sunburned. So these perfectly good potatoes are thrown away because there is no market for them.

THE POTATO PROJECT

In recent years, the Potato Project, our first attempt to really do something about hunger, has begun to make a significant impact on hunger within the United States.

In the first four years of this program over fifty-three million pounds of otherwise wasted potatoes and yams have been salvaged to feed hungry Americans. At a total cost of three and

a half cents a pound, nutritious produce that is normally dumped to rot is salvaged and distributed to foodbanks, Native American Reservations, and other agencies working to feed the hungry.

Now working in forty-seven states and the District of Columbia (see attached Produce Donation & Distribution Report), the Society of St. Andrew's Potato Project is a dual attack on hunger. It is a direct relief program that also addresses one of hunger's major causes, food waste. One of the simplest and most cost-effective programs in the fight to end hunger in the United States, the Potato Project is currently limited only by available finances.

The Potato Project has accomplished the salvage of this huge volume of produce working with less than one hundred farmers across the United States. And, as the name of the program implies, the focus has been primarily on the salvage and distribution of otherwise wasted potatoes. The potential for salvaging otherwise wasted produce at this level is staggering.

THE HARVEST OF HOPE

Now, as a direct offshoot of the Potato Project, we are immensely pleased to see another of our hunger programs, the Harvest of Hope, begin to spread across the country. An established program in less than three years, it is already obvious that this youth program has the potential to have an even greater impact on hunger than its parent program.

Like the Potato Project, the Harvest of Hope is an ecumenical hunger program with a dual emphasis. It is a produce salvage

program, while at the same time being an educational program, with a strong lifestyle emphasis. The goal of the Harvest of Hope is to allow participants to actually do something about hunger while exposing them to the many, multi-faceted dimensions of world hunger.

During the weeklong 1985 pilot project, forty-four senior high youth gleaned over 70,000 pounds of potatoes that otherwise would have been allowed to rot in the fields. It was dirty. The hours were long. But the participants all experienced the joy of knowing they shared in the miracle of transforming sweat and sore muscles into food for their hungry brothers and sisters.

But the work wasn't finished when the participants left the fields. Their intense physical labor was matched with study that was equally intensive. The result was that the Harvest of Hope participants were brought face to face with the realities of hunger.

This same basic experience is repeated at each Harvest of Hope activity. The youth involved may glean tomatoes or apples instead of potatoes. But the hard work on behalf of the hungry, and the face-to-face confrontation with the harsh realities of hunger is always there. And it changes the lives of those who participate.

For those that join in the Harvest of Hope, ending world hunger isn't just a one week adventure but a lifetime commitment. As one mother said of her daughter who participated, "She has changed. And because of her quiet witness our entire family has

become more responsive to the cries of the hungry."

That remark does a good job of summing up the hope of the Society of St. Andrew. In all that we do, the Potato Project, the Harvest of Hope, or other programs we begin, our desire is that all of us become more responsive to the cries of the hungry.

In that spirit, there are several recommendations that the Society of St. Andrew would like to make which we feel would enhance the gleaning of otherwise wasted produce.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. NATIONAL GLEANING CLEARINGHOUSE

With a staff of only six, the Society of St. Andrew has been able to salvage and distribute over 53 million pounds of otherwise wasted produce across the United States. This has been possible only through extensive networking. Locating distribution agencies is always difficult. A national clearinghouse would make it possible to expand distribution networks already in existence, as well as develop new ones.

A national clearinghouse would also have enormous potential for encouraging growers to participate in donating otherwise dumped produce. The ability of such an office to make the connection between grower, gleaner, and distribution would enhance the entire process.

2. PUBLICATION OF GLEANING HANDBOOK

There is little information available to the general public on the details of how to organize gleaning and produce salvage programs. The publication and distribution of such a

handbook or manual would greatly facilitate increased participation in gleaning programs by the private sector.

3. GLEANING PUBLICITY CAMPAIGN

Participation in gleaning efforts need to be encouraged. Growers, processors and retailers need to be encouraged to work with gleaning groups to insure that nutritious produce is not allowed to be wasted. Religious, civic, and volunteer service organizations need the same encouragement to become actively involved in gleaning projects. An advertising campaign directed at encouraging the transportation industry to provide free transportation of gleaned produce would also be helpful.

GLEANING 1986

Emergency Resource Bank
853 East First Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402
(513) 223-1835

American Red Cross
Dayton Area Chapter

For the Month of JUNE

Donor	Products	Weight (In Pounds)
Fulton Farms	Strawberries	2100
Old Barn Fruit Farm	Strawberries	883
	TOTAL	2983

For the Month of JULY

Donor	Products	Weight (In Pounds)
Cooks Home Produce	Sweet Peas	803
Slifers Presbyterian Church	Green Beans	896
Gourmet Gardens	Leaf Lettuce, Cauliflower, Swiss Chard, Cabbage, Mustard Greens	2933
Gourmet Gardens	Corn, Lettuce, Greens	828
Nell Cook Balzar	Apples	1400
Slifers Church	Green Beans	250
Cooks Home Produce	Green Beans	449
Slifers Church	Green Beans	375
Gourmet Gardens	Zucchini, Corn, Cucumbers	1504
Slifers Church	Green Beans	300
Gourmet Gardens	Corn, Lettuce, Beets	900
Gourmet Gardens	Lettuce, Corn, Beets, Chard, Green Beans	2400
Cooks Home Produce	Corn, Cucumber	2700
Ronald Eby	Corn	60
Scotts Farm	Pinto Beans	510
	TOTAL	16,308

GLEANING 1986
Page 2

For the Month of AUGUST

Donor	Products		Weight (In Pounds)
Gourmet Gardens	Tomatoes		1276
Gourmet Gardens	Green Beans, Tomatoes		727
Gourmet Gardens	Peppers, Tomatoes, Okra, Corn		284
Gourmet Gardens	Corn		2982
Gourmet Gardens	Corn		1680
Gourmet Gardens	Zucchini		327
Gourmet Gardens	Corn, Beets		821
Gourmet Gardens	Tomatoes		1168
Gourmet Gardens	Corn, Green Beans		1594
Marvin Cook	Pears		4830
		TOTAL	15,689

For the Month of SEPTEMBER

Donor	Products		Weight (In Pounds)
Nell Cook Balzar	Apples		891
Gourmet Gardens	Tomatoes, Okra, Green Beans, Green Peppers		1936
Gourmet Gardens	Tomatoes, Green Peppers		442
Gourmet Gardens	Tomatoes, Peppers		657
Slifers Presbyterian Church	Green Beans		219
Gourmet Gardens	Tomatoes		261
		TOTAL	4406

For the Month of OCTOBER

Donor	Products		Weight (In Pounds)
Gourmet Gardens	Tomatoes, Green Peppers		1189
		TOTAL	1189

TOTAL POUNDS GLEANED for 1986: 40,575

Total Number of Gleaners: 105 People
37 Groups

SOCIETY OF ST ANDREW'S POTATO PROJECT

PRODUCE DONATION REPORT
THROUGH JUNE 1987

STATE	83/84/85/86 LBS.	1987 TOTAL	GRAND TOTAL
ALABAMA	1,691,710	121,040	1,812,750
ARIZONIA	52,300	0	52,300
ARKANSAS	1,956,840	298,510	2,255,350
CALIFORNIA	3,962,900	1,048,500	5,011,400
COLORADO	2,413,280	228,660	2,641,940
FLORIDA	40,000	0	40,000
ILLINOIS	20,000	0	20,000
IOWA	2,844,300	40,140	2,884,440
IDAHO	60,280	0	60,280
MAINE	11,721,960	3,739,850	15,461,810
MICHIGAN	51,600	0	51,600
MINNESOTA	1,328,940	0	1,328,940
NEBRASKA	1,280,560	52,180	1,332,740
NEW MEXICO	40,000	0	40,000
NEW YORK	47,000	0	47,000
NORTH CAROLINA	2,919,420	40,400	2,959,820
NORTH DAKOTA	3,882,150	1,168,580	5,050,730
SOUTH CAROLINA	72,000	0	72,000
TEXAS	246,180	0	246,180
VIRGINIA	708,323	54,166	762,489
WISCONSIN	9,052,680	1,004,200	10,056,880
WYOMING	470,150	0	470,150
Lbs. Potatoes	44,862,573	7,796,226	52,658,799
Other Produce	369,050	175,050	544,100
Total	45,231,623	7,971,276	53,202,899

PRODUCE DISTRIBUTION REPORT

STATE	AGENCY	LOCATION	83/84/85/86 LBS.	YEAR TOTAL	PROJECT TOTAL
ALABAMA	U.WAY FB	BIRMINGHAM	162,800	6,150	168,950
ALABAMA	U. METH. CH.	SAND MTN.	1,843,840	45,000	1,888,840
ALABAMA	BAY AREA FB	MOBILE	41,700	8,200	49,900
			2,048,340	59,350	2,107,690
ARKANSAS	ARK.FOOD BANK	LITTLE ROCK	10,500	0	10,500
ARKANSAS	WE CARE	WRIGHTSVILLE	91,105	0	91,105
			101,605	0	101,605
ARIZONA	ST. MARY'S	PHOENIX	179,400	45,920	225,320
			179,400	45,920	225,320
CALIFORNIA	S.CLARA F.B.	SAN JOSE	811,800	279,000	1,090,800
CALIFORNIA	SR. GLEANERS	SACREMENTO	621,700	42,500	664,200
CALIFORNIA	PLACER CO.	AUBURN	227,000	45,000	272,000
CALIFORNIA	W.SOC.SER.	STOCKTON	224,500	0	224,500
CALIFORNIA	S.FRAN.F.B.	S.FRANCISCO	273,000	0	273,000
CALIFORNIA	HOOPA VALLEY	HOOPA VALLEY	47,500	0	47,500
CALIFORNIA	SUSANVILLE I.	SUSANVILLE	45,000	0	45,000
CALIFORNIA	SIERRA F.A.P.	GRASS VALLEY	132,500	0	132,500
CALIFORNIA	FRESNO C.F.R.	FRESNO	494,000	0	494,000
CALIFORNIA	L.A. COM.F.R.	LOS ANGELES	177,890	92,500	270,390
CALIFORNIA	SHASTA CO.	READING	167,700	88,000	255,700
CALIFORNIA	VENTURA F.S.	VENTURA	40,000	0	40,000
CALIFORNIA	LONG BEACH FB	LONG BEACH	325,750	137,500	463,250
CALIFORNIA	SURVIVE FB	RIVERSIDE	45,870	0	45,870
CALIFORNIA	LOV. W/O BOR.	SAN DIEGO	240,000	0	240,000
CALIFORNIA	PROJ. VOL.	OAKLAND	152,700	266,000	418,700
CALIFORNIA	PLUMAS CO.	QUINCY	22,000	24,000	46,000
CALIFORNIA	YUBA SRS.	YUBA CITY	0	29,000	29,000
CALIFORNIA	FOOD COAL.	CONCORD	0	45,000	45,000
			4,048,910	1,048,500	5,097,410
CONNECTICUT	NEW HAVEN FB	NEW HAVEN	145,000	0	145,000
			145,000	0	145,000
COLORADO	COL.F.B.	DENVER	116,100	44,000	160,100
COLORADO	SAL. ARMY	DENVER	95,000	0	95,000
COLORADO	COL.SPR.F.B.	COL.SPRINGS	45,000	0	45,000
COLORADO	SAL. ARMY	PUEBLO	45,000	0	45,000
COLORADO	NUTRITION CTR.	DENVER	90,600	40,000	130,600
			391,700	84,000	475,700
FLORIDA	DIV.PROV.FB	TAMPA	170,950	0	170,950
FLORIDA	MAT CHAR.D.C.	TAMPA	271,070	0	271,070
FLORIDA	MIAMI F.B.	MIAMI	81,800	0	81,800
FLORIDA	BEACON HOUSE	St. AUGUSTINE	186,100	44,100	230,200
FLORIDA	ORLANDO FB	ORLANDO	0	35,000	35,000
			709,920	79,100	789,020
GEORGIA	ATLANTA FB	ATLANTA	291,370	0	291,370
GEORGIA	SAL.ARMY	ATLANTA	143,000	0	143,000
GEORGIA	AUGUSTA F.B.	AUGUSTA	45,000	0	45,000
			479,370	0	479,370
IDAHO	S.CEN.COM.AC.	TWIN FALLS	10,000	0	10,000
IDAHO	IDAHO HUMBER	BOISE	33,420	0	33,420
IDAHO	VALLEY F.B.	LEWISTON	16,860	0	16,860
			60,280	0	60,280
ILLINOIS	CENT.ILL.FB	SPRINGFIELD	126,900	0	126,900
ILLINOIS	RIVER BEND	MOLINE	36,800	0	36,800
ILLINOIS	CHIC. FOOD D.	CHICAGO	542,750	44,900	587,650
ILLINOIS	LAND O LAKES	JOHNSTON CITY	46,000	0	46,000

1987 DISTRIBUTION REPORT

STATE	AGENCY	LOCATION	83/84/85/86 LBS.	YEAR TOTAL	PROJECT TOTAL
ILLINOIS	TOUCHETTE C.F.	BELLEVILLE	222,970	0	222,970
ILLINOIS	MEDA	CHICAGO	690,770	49,600	740,370
ILLINOIS	FOOD BANK	MILL SHOALS	46,900	0	46,900
			1,713,090	94,500	1,807,590
INDIANA	INDIAN.FB	INDIANAPOLIS	40,800	0	40,800
INDIANA	NW IND. FB	GARY	214,240	45,000	259,240
INDIANA	TRI STATE	EVANSVILLE	121,455	0	121,455
			376,495	45,000	421,495
IOWA	FB CEN. IOWA	DES MOINES	193,450	0	193,450
IOWA	CHRIS. CHURCH	MT. AYR	472,600	44,000	516,600
IOWA	SAX TRIBE	TAMA	87,100	0	87,100
IOWA	CEDAR VAL.	WATERLOO	783,770	210,200	993,970
IOWA	B/M INV. SER.	MONMOUTH	529,150	263,050	792,200
IOWA	SANDERS MIN.	MARSHALLTOWN	123,600	0	123,600
IOWA	AUBREY MIN.	MASSENA	45,800	0	45,800
IOWA	COM OPPORT.	JEFFERSON	168,000	41,800	209,800
IOWA	KOENEN	DUNLAP	42,500	41,800	84,300
IOWA	COM OPPORT.	COUNCIL BLUFFS	236,400	0	236,400
IOWA	COM OPPORT.	CARROLL	120,000	0	120,000
IOWA	COM OPPORT.	SIOUX CITY	160,000	0	160,000
IOWA	HACAP	CEDAR RAPIDS	81,600	170,940	252,540
IOWA	COM OPPORT.	RENSEN	40,000	0	40,000
IOWA	COM OPPORT.	SPENCER	84,900	0	84,900
IOWA	COM OPPORT.	HARLAN	40,000	0	40,000
IOWA	MATURA ACTION	CRESTON	120,000	0	120,000
IOWA	COM. OPPORT.	RED OAK	40,000	0	40,000
IOWA	COM. OPPORT.	AVALETON	40,400	0	40,400
IOWA	CHURCH ACT.	FONTENELLE	44,600	0	44,600
IOWA	N. BETHEL MIS.	DES MOINES	40,000	0	40,000
IOWA	GRINNELL MIN.	GRINNELL	0	44,000	44,000
			3,493,870	815,790	4,309,660
KANSAS	WICH. URBAN	WICHITA	194,060	0	194,060
KANSAS	KALLOUS MIN.	PITTSBURG	22,000	0	22,000
KANSAS	LETS HELP	TOPEKA	480,560	46,900	527,460
			696,620	46,900	743,520
KENTUCKY	DARE-CARE	LOUISVILLE	376,540	0	376,540
KENTUCKY	MUD CREEK	GRETCHEL	88,940	0	88,940
KENTUCKY	SHARE F.B.	LEXINGTON	45,000	0	45,000
			510,480	0	510,480
LOUISIANA	2nd HAR. N.O.	NEW ORLEANS	16,000	3,350	19,350
LOUISIANA	SHREVEPORT FB	SHREVEPORT	43,600	0	43,600
LOUISIANA	SHEPHERD CTR.	ALEXANDRIA	163,810	0	163,810
			223,410	3,350	226,760
MAINE	GOOD SHEP.	AUBURN	87,500	27,500	115,000
			87,500	27,500	115,000
MARYLAND	MARY. FB	BALTIMORE	957,150	25,000	982,150
MARYLAND	SALS.FB	SALISBURY	70,301	0	70,301
MARYLAND	BALT. CONF.	BALTIMORE	195,350	0	195,350
MARYLAND	ST. VIN. SOC.	LaPLATA	0	95,000	95,000
			1,222,801	120,000	1,342,801
MASSACHUSETTS	BOS.FB	BOSTON	95,800	0	95,800
MASSACHUSETTS	WES.MA.FB	HADLEY	102,450	0	102,450
MASSACHUSETTS	WOR.CO.FB	WORCHESTER	92,500	0	92,500
			290,750	0	290,750
MICHIGAN	GLEAN.FB	DETROIT	663,260	43,750	707,010

1987 DISTRIBUTION REPORT

STATE	AGENCY	LOCATION	83/84/85/86 LBS.	YEAR TOTAL	PROJECT TOTAL
			1,163,260	43,750	1,207,010
MINNESOTA	LAKE COUN.	MINNEAPOLIS	507,650	77,100	584,750
MINNESOTA	MILLE LAC	ONEMA	170,000	0	170,000
MINNESOTA	N. COUN. FB	CROOKSTON	272,700	0	272,700
MINNESOTA	ARROWHEAD	HIBBING	529,995	0	529,995
MINNESOTA	WHITE EARTH	MAHNOMEN	325,300	0	325,300
MINNESOTA	LEECH LAKE	CASS LAKE	90,300	80,000	170,300
MINNESOTA	NETT LAKE	NETT LAKE	40,000	0	40,000
MINNESOTA	ST. PAUL FB	ST. PAUL	120,300	199,900	320,200
MINNESOTA	DIS. MIN.	MINNEAPOLIS	558,700	441,000	999,700
MINNESOTA	GTR. MINN.	MINNEAPOLIS	120,000	0	120,000
			2,734,945	798,000	3,532,945
MISSISSIPPI	MISS. F. N.	JACKSON	231,580	8,900	240,480
MISSISSIPPI	SAL. ARMY	GREENVILLE	43,400	0	43,400
			274,980	8,900	283,880
MISSOURI	HARVESTERS	KANSAS CITY	153,000	0	153,000
MISSOURI	FOOD CRISIS	ST. LOUIS	45,000	0	45,000
MISSOURI	CREATIVE MIN.	COLUMBIA	95,500	0	95,500
MISSOURI	MO-KAN FB	ST. JOSEPH	40,000	0	40,000
MISSOURI	OP. FOOD SEA.	ST. LOUIS	884,890	293,740	1,178,630
MISSOURI	FARM CO.	MEMPHIS	0	86,800	86,800
			1,218,390	380,540	1,598,930
NEBRASKA	OMAHA F.B.	OMAHA	41,000	0	41,000
			41,000	0	41,000
NEVADA	PYRAMID IND.	PYRAMID LAKE	45,000	0	45,000
			45,000	0	45,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	METH. CHURCH	ROCHESTER	150,000	0	150,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N. ENG. FB	MANCHESTER	0	22,500	22,500
			150,000	22,500	172,500
NEW JERSEY	HOUSE REFUGE	PATTERSON	1,986,400	395,000	2,381,400
NEW JERSEY	NEWARK FB	NEWARK	90,000	50,000	140,000
			2,076,400	445,000	2,521,400
NEW MEXICO	ROADRUNNER	ALBUQUERQUE	47,900	0	47,900
			47,900	0	47,900
NEW YORK	FOOD SUR.	N.Y.CITY	155,500	0	155,500
NEW YORK	S.TIER FB	ELMIRA	241,000	22,500	263,500
NEW YORK	UTICA MIN.	UTICA	187,050	0	187,050
NEW YORK	CITY HARVEST	N.Y.CITY	667,700	245,500	913,200
NEW YORK	RAFFO	N.Y.CITY	555,000	350,200	905,200
NEW YORK	BALDWIN	N.Y.CITY	35,000	0	35,000
NEW YORK	REG.FB	ALBANY	70,000	22,500	92,500
NEW YORK	REG.FB	ROCHESTER	30,000	0	30,000
NEW YORK	SHARE	N.Y.CITY	51,900	0	51,900
NEW YORK	PEARS	N.Y.CITY	412,000	300,750	712,750
NEW YORK	BLOCK COUN.	N.Y.CITY	141,000	0	141,000
			2,546,150	941,450	3,487,600
NORTH CAROLINA	METROLINA	CHARLOTTE	57,200	45,916	103,116
NORTH CAROLINA	MANNA FB	ASHEVILLE	6,000	0	6,000
NORTH CAROLINA	SAL. ARMY	EASTERN REG.	13,600	0	13,600
NORTH CAROLINA	CAPE FEAR	FAYETTEVILLE	1,119,450	13,800	1,133,250
NORTH CAROLINA	LUMBEE IND.	PEMBROKE	1,238,470	41,840	1,280,310
NORTH CAROLINA	GREENSBORO FB	GREENSBORO	46,700	0	46,700
NORTH CAROLINA	C.F. RESCUE	WILMINGTON	216,410	0	216,410
NORTH CAROLINA	CHAR. RESCUE	CHARLOTTE	39,380	0	39,380
NORTH CAROLINA	RAL. RESCUE	RALIEGH	44,660	0	44,660

1987 DISTRIBUTION REPORT

STATE	AGENCY	LOCATION	83/84/85/86 LBS.	YEAR TOTAL	PROJECT TOTAL
NORTH CAROLINA	G.F.HENRY	BURGAW	253,265	0	253,265
			3,035,135	101,556	3,136,691
NORTH DAKOTA	TURTLE MT.	BELCOURT	464,725	156,600	621,325
NORTH DAKOTA	GTR.PLAINS	FARGO	99,900	0	99,900
			564,625	156,600	721,225
OHIO	CLEVE.FB	CLEVELAND	201,000	100,000	301,000
OHIO	TOLEDO SEA.	TOLEDO	679,840	94,000	773,840
OHIO	CIN.FB	CINCINNATI	146,400	0	146,400
OHIO	AKRON FB	AKRON	1,277,500	0	1,277,500
OHIO	SHARE	LISBON	566,950	378,000	944,950
OHIO	FB	YOUNGSTOWN	231,100	44,000	275,100
OHIO	REV. TROY	COLUMBUS	90,000	0	90,000
OHIO	EMER. Res.	DAYTON	74,320	0	74,320
			3,267,110	616,000	3,883,110
OKLAHOMA	OKLA.CITY FB	OKLA. CITY	43,800	0	43,800
OKLAHOMA	KIOWA	CARNEGIE	177,320	0	177,320
			221,120	0	221,120
OREGON	BURNS-PAIUTE	BURNS	45,000	0	45,000
			45,000	0	45,000
PENNSYLVANIA	ERIE FB	ERIE	115,000	0	115,000
PENNSYLVANIA	PITT.FB	PITTSBURG	705,500	250,000	955,500
PENNSYLVANIA	PHIL.FB	PHILADELPHIA	359,600	0	359,600
PENNSYLVANIA	FAYETTE CO.	UNIONTOWN	144,000	0	144,000
PENNSYLVANIA	CBN	PITTSBURG	47,500	0	47,500
PENNSYLVANIA	GTR.WERKS	READING	93,750	0	93,750
PENNSYLVANIA	S.CEN.FB	STEELTON	150,000	100,000	250,000
			1,615,350	350,000	1,965,350
RHODE ISLAND	R.I.FB	PROVIDENCE	444,150	0	444,150
			444,150	0	444,150
SOUTH CAROLINA	HAR.HOPE FB	COLUMBIA	67,300	0	67,300
SOUTH CAROLINA	COMM. F.B.	GREENVILLE	53,500	0	53,500
			120,800	0	120,800
SOUTH DAKOTA	SIOUX IND.	PIERRE	44,100	0	44,100
SOUTH DAKOTA	SIOUX IND.	ABERDEEN	83,000	0	83,000
			127,100	0	127,100
TENNESSEE	CHAT.FB	CHATANOOGA	72,500	0	72,500
TENNESSEE	SHARE F.B.	KNOXVILLE	45,000	0	45,000
TENNESSEE	MEMPHIS F.B.	MEMPHIS	134,150	129,200	263,350
TENNESSEE	NASHVILLE F.B.	NASHVILLE	14,000	0	14,000
TENNESSEE	ROANE CO. FB	ROCKWOOD	333,755	0	333,755
			599,405	129,200	728,605
TEXAS	HOUSTON FB	HOUSTON	821,290	0	821,290
TEXAS	N.TEXAS FB	DALLAS	156,490	0	156,490
TEXAS	CORPUS FB	CORPUS CHRISTI	402,710	0	402,710
TEXAS	TARRANT CO.	FT.WORTH	469,180	0	469,180
TEXAS	WIC.FALLS FB	WICHITA FALLS	48,160	0	48,160
TEXAS	TRUE LIFE	WAXAHACHIE	41,260	0	41,260
TEXAS	S.PLAINS FB	LUBBOCK	968,440	101,560	1,070,000
TEXAS	SAN ANT.FB	SAN ANTONIO	522,610	49,360	571,970
TEXAS	CAP.AREA FB	AUSTIN	43,590	0	43,590
TEXAS	LOAVES&FISHES	FT. WORTH	377,000	0	377,000
TEXAS	HARLINGEN C.A.	HARLINGEN	138,300	0	138,300
TEXAS	GULF COAST	HOUSTON	259,000	0	259,000
TEXAS	MISSION	HOUSTON	46,980	0	46,980
TEXAS	FOOD BANK	WACO	52,680	0	52,680

1987 DISTRIBUTION REPORT

STATE	AGENCY	LOCATION	83/84/85/86 LBS.	YEAR TOTAL	PROJECT TOTAL
			4,347,690	150,920	4,498,610
VERMONT	COM. ACTION	BARRE	289,350	0	289,350
			289,350	0	289,350
VIRGINIA	CEN. VA. FB	RICHMOND	76,332	0	76,332
VIRGINIA	S. E. VA. FB	CHESAPEAKE	257,900	0	257,900
VIRGINIA	S. W. VA. FB	ROANOKE	54,900	0	54,900
VIRGINIA	BLUE RIDGE	STAUNTON	499,260	0	499,260
VIRGINIA	SAL. ARMY	NORFOLK	291,490	0	291,490
VIRGINIA	COOPERATIVE	DANVILLE	79,950	40,000	119,950
VIRGINIA	XIAN F. B.	FAIRFAX STA.	131,700	514,850	646,550
VIRGINIA	RAM	ROANOKE	44,100	136,000	180,100
VIRGINIA	LAFB	LYNCHBURG	0	8,250	8,250
			1,445,632	699,100	2,144,732
WASHINGTON	COM. ACTION	VANCOUVER	92,300	0	92,300
			92,300	0	92,300
WASHINGTON D.C.	COUN. CHURCH	D.C.	1,607,890	322,800	1,930,690
WASHINGTON D.C.	CONV	D.C.	66,300	0	66,300
WASHINGTON D.C.	SHEL. WOMEN	D.C.	0	160,000	160,000
			1,674,190	482,800	2,156,990
WEST VIRGINIA	MT. FB	GASSAWAY	36,000	0	36,000
WEST VIRGINIA	W. VA. CONF.	CHARLESTON	50,000	0	50,000
			86,000	0	86,000
WISCONSIN	ONEIDA IND.	ONEIDA	46,100	0	46,100
WISCONSIN	SEC. MAR.	MILWAUKEE	40,700	0	40,700
			86,800	0	86,800
WYOMING	CHEYENE FB	CHEYENE	6,000	0	6,000
			6,000	0	6,000
INTERNATIONAL	CMS	DOM. REPUBLIC	42,500	0	42,500
	GLOBAL FB	MEXICO	90,750	0	90,750
	GLOBAL FB	CANADA	84,000	0	84,000
			217,250	0	217,250
			44,862,573	7,796,226	52,658,799
		OTHER CROPS	369,050	175,050	544,100
			45,231,623	7,971,276	53,202,899

SUMMARY: "Potato Project" delivers 53 million pounds of potatoes to feed the nation's hungry

Society of St. Andrew

The Society of St. Andrew is a world hunger ministry operated by a small staff from a small farm 15 miles north of Bedford in the rolling hills of Central Virginia.

Affiliated with the United Methodist Church (an approved Advance Special Program); the organization conducts a variety of hunger-solving missions throughout the United States and beyond.

The Potato Project, the Society's most well known effort, maintains national contacts with potato farmers and packers. It salvages potatoes that *look* too bad to sell but are perfectly good otherwise.

The Society pays the growers' cost of bagging the salvaged potatoes and pays the freight to the nearest distribution center, food bank, or other non-profit organization. Since its beginning in June, 1983, The Potato Project has been responsible for the distribution of 53 *million* pounds of potatoes to the nation's hungry — at a total cost of less than 4¢ per pound.

Other Society Activities

- Hunger awareness program
- Nutrition and natural food seminars
- Coordinating local ministries with the poor
- Providing a regional resource center on hunger and responsible lifestyles
- Advocacy for the world's poor and hungry
- Harvest of Hope gleaning program

The Society and its missions have been featured on NBC Nightly News, CBS Evening News, the 700 Club, and in numerous local newspaper articles. Its annual budget of approximately $700,000 comes primarily from churches, church agencies, foundations, and individuals.

POTATO PROJECT
Financial Report
1987 Totals

EXPENSES	
Freight	$ 94,834
Labor & Materials	165,160
Salaries	54,302
Office supplies, Equipment, Construction	2,188
Travel	16,801
Printing	7,040
Telephone	2,802
Postage	4,484
Insurance	3,460
Miscellaneous	12,007
	$363,078
INCOME	
Churches	$150,809
Church agencies	25,821
Foundations	31,132
Individuals	83,481
Corporations	27,759
Interest	3,538
	$322,540
POUNDS OF POTATOES DISTRIBUTED IN 1987	7,971,276
COST/POUND (Proj. Total)	$0.03416

The Potato

The potato is the world's most valued and most widely grown vegetable. It yields more nutrition in less space than any other major crop and contains many important elements.

A single average 2½-inch diameter potato provides all the nutrition shown in the following table:

Serving size	one medium potato (150 grams) about 1/3 pound
Calories	100
Protein	3 grams
Carbohydrate	22 grams

Percentage of U.S. recommended daily allowance (U.S. RDA)

Protein	6	Folic Acid	8
Vitamin C	35	Phosphorus	8
Thiamin	4	Magnesium	6
Niacin	10	Zinc	4
Iron	10	Copper	10
Vitamin B^6	20	Iodine	15

Otherwise wasted sweet potatoes feed Wilmington, N.C. hungry.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR REV. RAY A. BUCHANAN

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. TONY P. HALL

Question. What type of gleaning arrangements do you have with wholesalers?

Answer. The gleaning arrangements we have with wholesalers are very simple. When growers have produce what is nutritious but not marketable we ask them to donate that normally wasted produce to the Society of St. Andrew.

The grower donates the produce that is otherwise wasted. The Society of St. Andrew remiburses the grower any costs involved, which usually includes labor, container cost, and freight to point of distribution.

This arrangement works well for a number of reasons. The grower or packer is able to participate with minimal interference to his commercial operations. With the reimbursement for his costs, the grower has no financial burden for the program. With the assurance that none of the donated produce will be marketed, the growers are able to participate with confidence, realizing they are making a difference on behalf of the hungry.

Question. What steps has your organization taken to request the assistance of trucking and other transportation industries in your distribution efforts?

Follow up: What assistance have you sought, if any, for transportation assistance from the Government?

Answer. The Society of St. Andrew has attempted to secure "donated" freight on a great number of occasions, but without a great deal of success. Because of the logistics of moving fresh and perishable produce it is extremely difficult to make the necessary arrangements in locating free or even "at cost" transportation.

Our attempts have only been at local levels, and have not been at industry level.

Follow up: On occasion the Society of St. Andrew has benefitted from transportation assistance by National Guard units in the State of Alabama. This assistance was secured from within the State, however, and not directly by the SOSA.

Question. You recommended the creation of a national gleaning clearinghouse. How do you envision that entity working?

Answer. A national gleaning clearinghouse could prove to be an essential ingredient in the establishment of a viable national gleaning network. Such a clearinghouse would not only provide a focus for gleaning efforts it would be the key to the network.

The clearinghouse would be responsible for receiving and dispersing gleaning information, as well as coordinating efforts on a regional and national level. Other major functions of a clearinghouse would include providing the national promotional material necessary for such an effort, as well as providing instructional material for interested individuals and groups.

A clearinghouse is essential for a national gleaning network due to the magnitude of such a program and the need for a consistently well-coordinated effort. The Society of St. Andrew has been able to operate a national salvage network out of a single office with a very small staff. Our efforts show that it is possible that a few people can coordinate work across the entire county. This would be a function of the clearinghouse.

Question. How large a role can organizations like the Society of St. Andrew play in alleviating hunger in this country?

Answer. Organizations like the Society of St. Andrew should be able to play a major role in the alleviation of hunger within the United States. Private sector groups at the grassroots level can mobilize tremendous numbers of concerned individuals and free up enormous amounts of otherwise wasted food. With the proper leadership such groups could prove to be pivotal in effectively dealing with hunger in our country.

MATERIAL SUBMITTED BY SUSAN ARNEAUD, ACTING HUMAN SERVICES ADVISOR TO THE GOVERNOR, STATE OF MICHIGAN

Act No. 110
Public Acts of 1987
Approved by the Governor
July 10, 1987
Filed with the Secretary of State
July 13, 1987

STATE OF MICHIGAN

84TH LEGISLATURE

REGULAR SESSION OF 1987

Introduced by Reps. Gnodtke, Bartnik, Randall, Stacey, Ouwinga, Walberg, Connors, Gilmer, Muxlow, Weeks, Middaugh, Willis Bullard and Munsell

ENROLLED HOUSE BILL No. 4202

AN ACT to amend section 1 of Act No. 201 of the Public Acts of 1953, entitled as amended "An act restricting suits by persons coming upon the property of another for certain purposes; and to declare the limited liability of owners of property within this state," being section 300.201 of the Michigan Compiled Laws.

The People of the State of Michigan enact:

Section 1. Section 1 of Act No. 201 of the Public Acts of 1953, being section 300.201 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, is amended to read as follows:

Sec. 1. (1) Except as provided in subsection (3), no cause of action shall arise for injuries to any person who is on the lands of another without paying to the owner, tenant, or lessee of the lands a valuable consideration for the purpose of fishing, hunting, trapping, camping, hiking, sightseeing, motorcycling, snowmobiling, or any other outdoor recreational use, with or without permission, against the owner, tenant, or lessee of the land unless the injuries were caused by the gross negligence or willful and wanton misconduct of the owner, tenant, or lessee.

(2) No cause of action shall arise against the owner, tenant, or lessee of land or premises for injuries to any person who is on that land or premises for the purpose of gleaning agricultural or farm products, unless that person's injuries were caused by the gross negligence or willful and wanton misconduct of the owner, tenant, or lessee.

(3) No cause of action shall arise against the owner, tenant, or lessee of a farm used in the production of agricultural goods as defined by section 35(1)(h) of the single business tax act, Act No. 228 of the Public Acts of 1975, being section 208.35 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, for injuries to any person who is on that farm and has paid the owner, tenant, or lessee valuable consideration for the purpose of fishing or hunting, unless that person's injuries were caused by a condition which involved an unreasonable risk of harm and all of the following apply:

(a) The owner, tenant, or lessee knew or had reason to know of the condition or risk.

(b) The owner, tenant, or lessee failed to exercise reasonable care to make the condition safe, or to warn the person of the condition or risk.

(c) The person injured did not know or did not have reason to know of the condition or risk.

(4) No cause of action shall arise against the owner, tenant, or lessee of land or premises for injuries to any person, other than an employee or contractor of the owner, tenant, or lessee, who is on the land or premises for the purpose of picking and purchasing agricultural or farm products at a farm or "u-pick" operation, unless the person's injuries were caused by a condition which involved an unreasonable risk of harm and all of the following apply:

(a) The owner, tenant, or lessee knew or had reason to know of the condition or risk.

(b) The owner, tenant, or lessee failed to exercise reasonable care to make the condition safe, or to warn the person of the condition or risk.

(c) The person injured did not know or did not have reason to know of the condition or risk.

(5) As used in this section, "agricultural or farm products" means the natural products of the farm, nursery, grove, orchard, vineyard, garden, and apiary, including, but not limited to, trees and firewood.

This act is ordered to take immediate effect.

David H. Ewan

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

David H. Hann

Secretary of the Senate.

Approved .....

.....

Governor.

[No. 130]

(HB 4494)

AN ACT to amend section 263 of Act No. 281 of the Public Acts of 1967, entitled "An act to meet deficiencies in state funds by providing for the imposition, levy, computation, collection, assessment, and enforcement by lien and otherwise of taxes on or measured by net income; to prescribe the manner and time of making reports and paying the taxes, and the functions of public officers and others as to the taxes; to permit the inspection of the records of taxpayers; to provide for interest and penalties on unpaid taxes; to provide exemptions, credits and refunds of the taxes; to prescribe penalties for the violation of this act; to provide an appropriation; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts," as amended by Act No. 417 of the Public Acts of 1984, being section 206.263 of the Michigan Compiled Laws.

The People of the State of Michigan enact

Section amended; income tax act of 1967.

Section 1. Section 263 of Act No. 281 of the Public Acts of 1967, as amended by Act No. 417 of the Public Acts of 1984, being section 206.263 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, is amended to read as follows:

206.263 Tax credit for agricultural products gleaned from agricultural property; form; maximum credit; credit claimable by partner or shareholder; certification by organization conducting gleaning; "glean" defined; organization or agency authorized to perform gleaning; credit not applicable for certain tax years. [M.S.A. 7.557(1263)]

Sec. 263. (1) A taxpayer who is engaged in agricultural operations as defined in section 9 of Act No. 206 of the Public Acts of 1893, as amended, being section 211.9 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, may claim a credit against the tax imposed by this act for the taxable year in an amount equal to 20% of the current wholesale market value of the agricultural products which the taxpayer allowed to be gleaned from the agricultural property. The department shall upon request provide the taxpayer with a form required to obtain a credit under this section.

(2) The credit allowed under this section shall not exceed the tax liability for the taxable year.

(3) A partner or shareholder in a corporation or partnership with not more than 8 shareholders or partners may claim the credit permitted by this section against his or her individual income tax liability for gleaning permitted by the partnership or corporation. The credit shall be a percentage of the credit permitted in subsection (1) equal to the percentage of the person's ownership in the partnership or corporation.

(4) A taxpayer claiming a credit under this section shall provide, on a form prescribed by the department, a certification by the organization conducting the gleaning, of the following information:

(a) The name and address of the organization.

(b) The amount and type of the crop.

(c) The current wholesale market value of the appropriate USDA grade for that crop.

(d) A description of the process followed by the organization for distribution of the crops.

(5) As used in this section, "glean" means the process of collecting crops which were not harvested in the normal course by the agricultural operations when the collecting is performed for charitable purposes to provide food for human consumption and not for sale. For purposes of this section, gleaning shall be performed only by an organization or agency operated not for profit.

(6) The credit allowed under this section shall not apply for tax years commencing after December 31, 1988.

This act is ordered to take immediate effect.
Approved June 15, 1986.
Filed with Secretary of State June 16, 1986.

Copied from Michigan Compiled Laws Annotated

206.263. Credit for value of agriculture products gleaned from taxpayer's property; form, limit, corporations and partnerships, certification, glean defined, application

Sec. 263. (1) A taxpayer who is engaged in agricultural operations as defined in section 9 of Act No. 206 of the Public Acts of 1893, as amended, being section 211.9 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, may claim a credit against the tax imposed by this act for the taxable year in an amount equal to 20% of the current wholesale market value of the agricultural products which the taxpayer allowed to be gleaned from the agricultural property * * *. The department shall upon request provide the taxpayer with a form required to obtain a credit under this section.

(2) The credit allowed under this section shall not exceed the tax liability for the taxable year.

(3) A partner or shareholder in a corporation or partnership with not more than 8 shareholders or partners may claim the credit permitted by this section against his or her individual income tax liability for gleaning permitted by the partnership or corporation. The credit shall be a percentage of the credit permitted in subsection (1) equal to the percentage of the person's ownership in the partnership or corporation.

(4) A taxpayer claiming a credit under this section shall provide, on a form prescribed by the department, a certification by the organization conducting the gleaning, of the following information:

(a) The name and address of the organization.

(b) The amount and type of the crop.

(c) The current wholesale market value of the appropriate USDA grade for that crop.

(d) A description of the process followed by the organization for distribution of the crops.

(5) As used in this section, "glean" means the process of collecting * * * crops which were not harvested in the normal course by the agricultural operations when the collecting is performed for charitable purposes to provide food for human consumption and not for sale. For purposes of this section, gleaning shall be performed only by an organization or agency operated not for profit.

(6) The credit allowed under this section shall not apply for tax years commencing after December 31, 1988.

Amended by P.A.1986, No. 130, § 1, Imd. Eff. June 16.

1986 Legislation

The 1986 amendment, in subsec. (1), in the first sentence, substituted "20%" for "10%", and deleted "after the harvest" following "gleaned from the agricultural property"; in subsec. (5), in the first sentence, deleted "leftover" preceding "crops which", and formed the second sentence by inserting ". For purposes of this section, gleaning shall be performed only"; and, in subsec. (6), substituted "1988" for "1985".

Law Review Commentaries

Tax refunds: Changes to tax benefit rule. George W. Gregory, 63 Mich.B.J. 1206 (1984).

Deletions from text indicated by asterisks * * *

Prepared Statement of Herschel A. Smith, Potato Farmer, Blaine, ME

My name is Herschel Smith from Maine. I am a grower, packer, and shipper of vegetables, including: potatoes, broccoli, lettuce, cabbage, spinach, squash, and cauliflower. Our shipping season for potatoes extends from about August 20th to July 1st. New storage technology is now available to extend our potato season to twelve months, or in other words, year around and probably will be done in the near future. The other vegetables are more perishable. Their marketing is from July 15th to about October 15th or 20th.

I became involved in supplying potatoes to the needy through the Society of St. Andrews in November of 1983, and have continued to participate in the program since that time. According to a quick research of my records, which I think are fairly accurate, I supplied 67 trailer loads of potatoes to this program out of the 1983 - 1984 crop year.

62 loads from the 1984-1985 year
92 loads from the 1985-1986 year
79 loads from the 1986-1987 year

If we calculate 1,000 fifty pound bags per trailer, which is conservative, it would make a total of 15,000,000 pounds of potatoes supplied in four years. To state it in more realistic terms, that would be one serving of 8 ounces for 30 million people, or bringing it closer to home - enough potatoes to serve every person in Maine 30 meals.

In addition to the potato program, I also allow the local people to gleam my fields of vegetalbes after I have harvested that which is economically feasible. The amount available for gleaming of these vegetables varies greatly from vegetable to vegetable and from day to day, depending on growing conditions and market prices. Being in a rural area, gleaming far exceeds the demand. The balance left is worked back into the soil, hauled to the dump, or fed to cattle.

I am not looking for tax write offs, I am in the same position as hundreds of other farmers in the United States with a surplus problem of less than No. 1 grade unmarketable produce. If I were to have hauled that fifteen million pounds of potatoes to the dump, I would have created a serious environmental problem and several thousand dollars of expense bulldozing it under. Not to mention the wrath of neighbors for miles around on account of the odors.

There are literarily hundreds of millions of pounds of good usable produce in this country that go to waste every month. Only last month, I understand, California Potato Growers plowed under several hundred acres of good potatoes, simply because it was not economically feasible to harvest and pack them. Does it not make good sense to try to get as much of this product as possible to the truly needy? The Society of St. Andrews should be congratulated in taking the initiative to organize such a commendable program

to distribute these commodities. But they and others like them need help. They have merely scratched the surface. Much more needs to be done.

Now a word of caution, in considering expansion of these types of programs, careful safeguards should be in place to prevent escalating cost of middlemen,such as, brokerage and handling fees.

Safeguards against abuses such as reselling a product.

Safeguards to prevent the taking of legitimate customers from struggling businesses.

Safeguards against deterioration and waste.

I wish to thank you for the opportunity to testify before this committee. I hope you are successful in structuring some sort of practical, workable program of bypassing the very expensive normal channels of distribution, and delivering some of this wasted food to the truly needy. It is long overdue.

Prepared Statement of James D. Riggle, Director of Field Operations, American Farmland Trust

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I am Jim Riggle, Director of Field Operations for the American Farmland Trust (AFT). On behalf of the board of directors, staff and members of AFT, I thank you for the opportunity to submit this statement for the record of today's hearing.

AFT is a private non-profit organization committed to the conservation of America's farmland and soil resources, and to the development and promotion of affordable and sustainable farming and related economic opportunities. AFT's work is supported by a network of nearly 40,000 dues-paying members nationwide.

Research conducted by AFT has demonstrated that approximately 60 percent of the nation's most productive farming counties are located within or adjacent to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA). By definition, this places America's most productive farms within easy reach of our urban populations.

During the last few years, many farmers, particularly those with access to urban markets, have begun to produce fruits, vegetables and other high value crops and livestock products. These new ventures represent farmers' desire to diversify production away from surplus corn, soybean and wheat and their attendant low prices, to utilize state agriculture departments' marketing assistance programs, and to meet consumers' demands for fresher, more healthful foods.

Linking producers to consumers is the key element needed for successful initiatives in producing high value foods. This can be accomplished through farmers markets, "U-pick" operations or more sophisticated wholesale or retail marketing strategies. Gleaning is another method of linking farmers with consumers, but one which may suffer from a growing trend among landowners.

Across the country, increasing members of landowners are posting farmlands and other open space against public access for any reason. The fear of liability for accidents or injuries is the reason most commonly cited by farmers for posting land against trespassing or other access.

Preliminary investigation by AFT has shown that there is probably little real risk, certainly less than perceived, associated with allowing limited public access to private land. However, even the perception of risk is real, resulting in the refusal of insurance companies to issue liability coverage, higher than necessary insurance premiums, or more land posted as off limits.

Several states are in various stages of exempting landowners from liability in exchange for allowing certain activities, including gleaning among others. Other states have refused similar statutes on the grounds that such actions may open the "deep pockets" of state coffers in the event of a liability claim, i.e., that the state has accepted the burden of "insurer", without addressing the question of actual risk.

A more desirable solution is that private insurance companies sell affordable liability coverage to landowners, or perhaps to non-profit organizations. Low, or affordable, insurance rates will require the demonstration of low risk, an area where there is a clear and temporary role for government assistance.

Conceptually, a dedicated pool of liability insurance protection would be created and apportioned among participating private companies. The federal government, individual states or both acting together would underwrite or guarantee a percentage of any claims which might be paid, up to a predetermined limit and for a specific period of time.

For example, suppose a group of insurance companies is willing to share equally in establishing a $200 million liability pool. Policies written under this pool would be limited to landowners who allow gleaning on their land, and churches, charities or other non-profit organizations involved in efforts to make food available to hungry Americans.

For its part, the government would stand ready to pay the last 25% of any legitimate claim which might have to be paid from the pool, up to $20 million per year for a period of 3 years. The government would also require that premiums for policies issued under this program be lower, compared with prevailing similar policies, reflecting the companies' reduced exposure due to the government's participation.

There are several advantages to an approach such as this. They include:

-- For potentially no direct cost, government could secure a source of otherwise wasted food and promote a desirable land use.

-- With actual liability determined under the three year sunset provisions, private businesses thereafter could enjoy reasonable profits while facilitating the accomplishment of important public goals.

-- Assuming that gleaning is indeed shown to be an extremely low or no risk venture, private insurers may well be induced to begin donating liability coverage to non-profit groups as an in-kind charitable contribution.

GAO
United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Resources, Community, and
Economic Development Division

R7-0332

August 4, 1987

The Honorable Leon E. Panetta
Chairman, Domestic Task Force,
Select Committee on Hunger
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Subject: Opportunities and Constraints Regarding Gleaning in the United States

For use in your August 5, 1987, hearing to examine what role gleaning--gathering produce left in the fields after harvesting--can play in supplementing the food supply of low-income Americans, we are providing you with relevant information contained in our reports during the last 10 years. Three reports relate in particular to activities such as gleaning.

1. Food Waste: An Opportunity to Improve Resource Use (CED-77-118, September 16, 1977)

2. Public and Private Efforts to Feed America's Poor (GAO/RCED-83-164, June 23, 1983)

3. Implementation of Section 191 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 (Provides a sense of the Congress on surplus food distribution to hungry people and on Good Samaritan donor liability laws) (GAO/RCED-83-190, July 8, 1983)

Our 1977 report on food waste provides an overview of food loss in the entire U.S. food system, from farmers' fields through consumers' plates, using 1974 crop year data. In that report we estimated that the loss during harvesting for crop year 1974 was 60 million tons of food valued at $5 billion.

We pointed out that a substantial portion of food loss is safe nutritious food that would be consumed if it could be recovered and channeled to the needy. With respect to loss at harvest, we discussed gleaning activities as one possible avenue of making effective use of food that would otherwise be lost. We noted several groups that were involved in channeling such food to the needy. For example, a senior citizens group in Monterey County, California, was picking up about 4 tons of vegetables a week. The essential element is to have a logistical infrastructure available to pick up and distribute the food.

R7-0332

In our 1977 report, we recommended that the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture review opportunities for encouraging charitable donations of food that would otherwise be wasted. We are not aware of any specific actions taken by the Department of Agriculture in response to this recommendation.

Our 1983 report on public and private efforts to feed the poor also addressed, among other things, gleaning activities and other private sector responses to feeding the needy, such as food banks and soup kitchens. We pointed out that many of these institutions and activities have some professional workers, but most rely heavily on volunteers. Most, if not all, were heavily dependent on donations of money and foodstuffs to be successful.

With respect to gleaning, we pointed out that a handful of states had enacted legislation to provide individual farmers with tax incentives to make charitable contributions of foodstuffs. Another set of state laws positively affecting the donations of food to the needy are the so-called "Good Samaritan" laws, which had a common purpose of limiting the liability of food donors.

During our work, we observed gleaning activities in California and learned from various sources that gleaning occurred in other states, including Oregon, Washington, Michigan, Arizona, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Florida, and Texas. We learned in 1983 that gleaning activities were often limited by a shortage of transport vehicles. Oftentimes the gleaning groups had too little capacity to transport the volumes of food available. The four gleaning groups we contacted at the time of our review relied heavily on a few pickup trucks and on members' private vehicles for which the groups provided gas money. One group said it was spending about $2,500 a month on gas. Another group told us that it had sufficient transport vehicles at the time but that it was operating at capacity. This group had 500 people on a waiting list to join the organization, but it would add members only as it obtained the facilities and transport vehicles to handle the additional food. Gleaner groups were generally looking for medium-sized vehicles to more economically and flexibly transport their members and the gleaned food. One group we contacted was looking for a 5-ton truck and a 12-person van; others needed a source of funds for gas money.

We pointed out that some of the needs identified by the organizations we contacted might be met through the Federal Surplus Property Program. This program channels--through state agencies in cooperation with the General Services

R7-0332

Administration--excess federal property, including trucks and vans, to qualifying state and local programs at low cost. Local government activities are generally eligible, as are charitable programs for senior citizens, education, training, and recreation.

We also discussed the issue of staffing. We were told by officials of several gleaning groups that although volunteers were often readily available, large amounts of fresh farm produce sometimes had to be turned down because they lacked sufficient paid supervisory employees to manage and direct the gathering, processing, and distribution of the food. In these instances, the food usually was left in the field or destroyed.

We concluded that evidence in our report and elsewhere showed that some steps had been taken to channel to the needy food that would otherwise be wasted. We stated that increased awareness and sensitivity to the problem of food waste could perhaps result in the identification of additional ways in which the food needs of the poor might be eased through greater use of food that would otherwise be discarded.

Our 1983 report on section 191 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, although it did not specifically discuss gleaning activities, summarized the steps taken by federal agencies to distribute surplus food to hungry people and the status of state-enacted "Good Samaritan" laws to encourage private cooperation efforts to feed hungry people. At that time, such laws had been enacted by 46 of the 50 states.

In summary, gleaning offers an opportunity to use unused food resources to satisfy some basic needs through public/private cooperation. Our past reports have recognized both the opportunities and constraints of gleaning. Gleaning illustrates that a worthwhile effort is being accomplished without federal expenditures by private organizations and businesses.

As new gleaning operations are started, they have the advantage of learning from past experience. Although previous gleaning efforts have demonstrated the opportunities for reclaiming food that would otherwise be wasted, the logistical problems of setting up and operating a successful network can be significant and will require a well-managed operation. There are a number of organizations with successful gleaning experience and insights that would be useful in initiating new gleaning operations. Such organizations include Second

R7-0332

Harvest; Senior Gleaners, Inc.; and the Society of St. Andrews.

We trust that this information will be useful to you in your efforts to focus attention on the role that gleaning activities can play in supplementing the food supply of low-income Americans.

Sincerely yours,

Brian P. Crowley
Senior Associate Director